





THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

---

REPORT  
OF A  
PUBLIC DISCUSSION

WHICH TOOK PLACE

**AT OLDHAM,**

ON THE EVENINGS OF TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY.

FEBRUARY 19th and 20th, 1839,

BETWEEN

**THE REV. J. BARKER,**

Of the Methodist New Connexion, Mossley,

AND

**MR. LLOYD JONES,**

Of Manchester, Social Missionary,

ON

THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

---

REVISED BY THE DISPUTANTS.

---

MANCHESTER:

PRINTED BY CAVE AND SEVER, POOL FOLD.

1839.

2214

The first of these is the fact that the  
 second of these is the fact that the  
 third of these is the fact that the  
 fourth of these is the fact that the  
 fifth of these is the fact that the  
 sixth of these is the fact that the  
 seventh of these is the fact that the  
 eighth of these is the fact that the  
 ninth of these is the fact that the  
 tenth of these is the fact that the



# REPORT,

&c.

---

A PUBLIC Discussion took place in Braddock's Large Room, Terrace-buildings, Oldham, on the Evenings of Tuesday and Wednesday, February 19th and 20th, 1839, between the Rev. J. Barker, of Mossley, Minister in the Methodist New Connexion, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, of Manchester, Lecturer on the Social Doctrines of Mr. Robert Owen, on the influence of Christianity.

The discussion originated in an article on Socialism, published in No. 5, vol. II, of Mr. Barker's Evangelical Reformer. This article gave rise to a correspondence between Mr. Barker and the Social District Board in Manchester. This Board appointed Mr. Lloyd Jones, their accredited missionary, to meet Mr. Barker upon the questions as hereafter stated. As the correspondence has been already published by both parties, and may be seen either in Mr. Barker's Evangelical Reformer, or in the New Moral World, it will be unnecessary further to allude to it. Suffice it to say, that prelimina-

ries were at length settled, and the Discussion agreed to be held as above.

Admission to the room was by ticket, price sixpence each, for each evening, of which an equal number was taken by the Committees of the respective Disputants. All the tickets issued were eagerly bought up, and there was a demand for many more tickets than could be supplied.

---

*First Day, TUESDAY, February 19th.*

---

THE Discussion commenced a few minutes after seven o'clock, at which time the room was densely crowded. The Disputants were placed at each end of a large table upon the platform, where also sat the Chairmen and the Umpire.

MR. HALLIWELL first presented himself to the audience, and said—I will begin the business by stating the terms on which our friends Mr. Barker and Mr. Jones meet this evening. The question, as you would see by the printed handbills, is confined within very narrow limits, and is to the following effect :—

“First, Whether Christianity be the cause of all the crime and misery in our country; and secondly, Whether Christianity be not the cause of good wherever it operates, and good of every kind.”

Mr. Barker undertakes to prove that Christianity is not the cause of the misery and crime that abound in this country; that the tendency of Christianity is to produce only good; that, wherever it operates it produces good, and good of every kind.

“Condition—That in the debate nothing shall be taken for Christianity but the system of Jesus Christ, as laid down in the New Testament.”

This is the matter for discussion; and let it be understood to this meeting, that if any dispute shall arise between Mr. Connard and myself, who have been appointed chairmen respectively for the parties, a decision will be given by the umpire, Mr. Halliday, which will be final. So that if Mr. Connard and myself disagree, as to what may or may not be a point of order, we shall not have to submit it to the meeting, as on ordinary occasions, but to the umpire, who will decide the matter; and with his decision both we and the meeting must be content. With regard to the speakers, I have no doubt the language of each will be kind and courteous, and such as to excite no ill feeling in each other's mind. I am sure that I can vouch for Mr. Barker, that he will conduct his speeches in such a way as to give no offence to any one; and I am sure Lloyd Jones will do the same. With regard to time, for the first two speeches, half an hour each will be allowed; and for the second, third, and fourth speeches, on each side, twenty minutes each. It will be understood by the meeting that it has been thought advisable,—and I think it is exceedingly advisable,—that there should be no approbation shown,—no disapprobation shown. Therefore, the meeting will oblige the chairmen particularly if they will hear the speeches in silence; if they will judge on the subject matter of those speeches calmly, and will decide on the matter of those speeches wisely. That is all we require. I hope we shall not have to interfere in any way to suppress applause. I hope the observations I have made will induce you to listen attentively, and to show no signs of applause or disapprobation. I am sure Mr. Barker's friends will concur in the propriety of my remarks,—at least I hope so. With regard to Lloyd Jones's friends, they are not in the habit of giving either applause or disapprobation; therefore, if any expression of feeling take place, it will at once be said that it arises from the friends of Mr. Barker. Hence, as a point of honour, you see you are bound not to show the slightest approbation or disapprobation. The first speaker to-night is Lloyd Jones; the

first speaker to-morrow night will be Mr. Barker. Unless Mr. Connard has some observations to make to you, previous to the commencement of the debate, I will now call on Lloyd Jones to commence the discussion.

MR. CONNARD :—I agree in all that Mr. Halliwell has said ; and I am fully confident that if you pay strict attention to what he has said, the discussion will prove both interesting and beneficial to all.

MR. JONES :—

Ladies and Gentlemen,—I would observe, before we commence the proceedings of this evening, in addition to what has been said by Mr. Halliwell, that it is of the utmost importance to every man and woman in this room, that they should pay strict attention to what may be advanced upon both sides of this question ; and unless due order be preserved, by each person in the room, it will be utterly impossible to pay that attention to the subject which its importance demands. The chairman has read to you, from the placards, the subject matter for consideration : I have only to say, that I am proud the day has arrived in which we can come boldly and freely before the public, and canvass every subject and every question that has any bearing, directly or indirectly, upon human happiness ; and do it without any degree of fear, as to our own personal safety. I am well pleased that the day has gone by when personal injury might be apprehended. It is only by according to each other perfect freedom of opinion, and perfect liberty to express such opinion,—it is only by granting to each other advantages and liberties of this kind, that the human family can ever arrive at such satisfactory arrangements as are calculated to secure to them peace and happiness. I hold no prejudice in common with the generality of this meeting, or with the generality of society. I come before you to speak what I consider truths of the highest importance. As I before stated, holding no prejudice in common with you, I expect no very kindly feeling from you for the truths which I shall speak to you. Founded as your opinions are

upon a false conception of what human nature really is, I know it is utterly impossible for you, when such opinions are questioned, to feel comfortable, or to extend that feeling of charity to the individual who questions those opinions, which it is necessary you should extend. It is only from a deep conviction that you are most lamentably astray relative to the real nature of yourselves, that I come here in opposition to the established opinions, fully prepared to meet whatever may be offered in opposition to me.

It has been announced in the placard, and by Mr. Barker's chairman, that the first point to be discussed is,—Whether Christianity has produced all the misery and crime in the country? Now, my friends, I agreed to the insertion of this proposition in the placard, solely, because I could not get Mr. Barker to public discussion on any other conditions. I never made a statement of that kind; no person belonging to the society to which I belong ever made a statement of that kind. The statement only existed in the imagination of Mr. Barker: and as he has a disposition to combat such statement, I have no objection that he should do so, for half an hour, if he thinks proper. But I have every objection to meet him upon the subject of a proposition, which I believe to be absurd and false. I have now to call on Mr. Barker to settle this part of the matter with me before we proceed any further. I did not say that Christianity had produced all the evils in the world; but I do say that it has produced a great portion of those evils, a great portion of the sufferings and miseries which the human race has gone through for hundreds of years. I am, therefore, quite ready to meet him on the second proposition, and to contest it inch by inch; but the first is but a phantom of his own imagination. Mr. Barker alleges this statement to have been made by our writers: I deny the fact, and defy him to prove it to be true. When the challenge was first given, Mr. Barker stated that Mr. Haslam had said so in his "Necessity of a Change." I deny it. It is not true that Christianity has produced all the evils in the country; and no man in our society ever said so. If

Mr. Barker can establish that, he will establish a proposition which never originated in the mind of any of our society. I therefore put myself in this position ; that if the first proposition be a falsehood, it is a falsehood imagined by Mr. Barker, and not affirmed by us. The second proposition is a truth, and upon it I am prepared to meet Mr. Barker.

Mr. BARKER:—

Mr. Chairman,—I am somewhat surprised at the course pursued by my opponent on the present occasion. I expected that the question, as read over by the chairman, would have been the subject for discussion this evening ; I had not the least anticipation that any question would be started here, as to whether certain charges had been made by the Socialist writers or not. That point was understood to be entirely settled and set aside, at the interview which I and my friends had with Lloyd Jones and his friends. Those charges were talked about at that interview, and Lloyd Jones contended that they had never been made either by him or by their writers, but he also added, “ I make them now, and I will prove them.” And it was on the faith of this declaration, and on the faith of his written engagement to discuss the questions in the order in which they have been read to you from the hand-bill, that I agreed to meet him. What course to pursue, therefore, on the present occasion, I can scarce tell. If it had been so arranged, I should not have had any objection to discuss the second proposition. Of course, my expectation was, that it would be discussed thoroughly in its turn, and that the whole subject would be properly gone through. But as Lloyd Jones sets aside the first question, the only course that remains for me to pursue at present is, to hear what Lloyd Jones has to say respecting the miseries and crimes which he says Christianity has produced : he says that it has not produced all the crime and misery in the country, but that it has produced a great deal. I will therefore wait to hear what those miseries and crimes are, which, in his opinion, Christianity has produced ; and after that I will reply.

Mr. JONES :—

Friends,—We now come to the second proposition to be discussed,—the amount of crime produced by Christianity ; and now I am fully prepared to meet Mr. Barker on this subject. One of the conditions of our agreement was, “that nothing shall be taken for Christianity but the system of Christ, as laid down in the New Testament.” I am not about to take any thing else. I will take from it those passages in which your mistake, and the mistake of the early Christians, relative to the constitution of human nature, is made manifest ; and from those passages, I will trace the influence of that mistake, from the first day of the establishment of this religion down to the present moment. I have often stated to you, that your convictions relative to any proposition were involuntary,—that they necessarily followed, when a sufficiency of evidence was presented to your mind to cause conviction. The New Testament pre-supposes the opposite, because it is continually offering rewards for a certain state of mind, or for the entertainment of certain convictions ; and threatening punishment for an opposite state of mind, or convictions of an opposite description. I will read to you, from the New Testament, those passages that I consider illustrative of that mistake ; and then, as I before promised you, I will, by detailing to you the conduct of those who acted under the influence of such belief, prove to you that the entertainment of such opinions, or the entertainment of that mistake, which is the groundwork of the Christian religion, has produced in practice results of the most lamentable description. I will first refer to Acts xiii. 6 : and the reason why I quote this passage particularly, is this, that Beza, a reformed writer, wrote a book in favour of persecution, and to give countenance and authority to that work, he quoted the passage I am about to read to you. I will begin at the fourth verse :—“ So they, being sent forth of the Holy Ghost, departed into Seleucia ; and from hence they sailed to Cyprus. And when they were at Salamis, they preached the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews ; and they had also John to their

minister. And when they had gone through the isle into Paphos, they found a certain sorcerer, a false prophet, a Jew, whose name was Bar-jesus, which was with the deputy of the country, Sergius Paulus, a prudent man; who called for Barnabas and Saul, and desired to hear the word of God. But Elymas, the sorcerer, (for so is his name by interpretation) withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith."

Now, I wish you to pay particular attention to this passage. This Elymas, the sorcerer, obstructed Barnabas and Saul, and sought to turn away the deputy from the faith. "Then Saul, (who is also called Paul,) filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes upon him, and said, O full of all subtilty and mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now, behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness; and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand." The next passage I shall refer to, is Galatians, i. 8, 9:—"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel to you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other Gospel to you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." I will next refer you to Galatians v. 12:—"I would they were even cut off which trouble you." I will next refer to Titus iii. 16:—"A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." Now, my friends, what I have read to you here are the words of the disciples of Christ. I maintain that they breathe a spirit of uncharitableness; that when they tell you to reject a man because he is a heretic, it is because he entertains a different state of mind, or different convictions from those which you entertain; I maintain that the rejection of a brother, in consequence of his being heterodox and heretical in his opinions, is uncharitableness of the worst description. But these passages, after all, are from the writings of the disciples of Christ: now I will read you, from his own mouth, words confir-



matory of those which I have read from the writings of his disciples. This, I hope, will be authority sufficient for every true and good Christian.

I will now refer to the 16th chapter of Mark, and will begin at the 14th verse:—"Afterward he appeared to the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye unto all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Now this is the verse to which I wish you to pay particular attention; it is the verse which pre-supposes the voluntary nature of belief. After desiring them to go forth and preach the Gospel, he says,—“He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe in my name: they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues.”

I have now read to you passages from the writings of the disciples of Christ, which prove that they countenanced persecution in this world; and I have read to you, to crown all, a passage from the mouth of Christ himself, which positively asserts that if you do not believe certain dogmas,—it does not say a single word about evidence, about the necessity of inquiry—here is no neutral ground to stand on—the positive and frightful assertion is made,—“Go and preach these things: they that believe and are baptized shall be saved, and they that believe not shall be *damned*.” The disciples here countenanced, as I told you before, persecution in this world; and Christ has expressly declared that he will persecute and punish in the next. It is, therefore, my duty and business tonight, taking these passages as the groundwork of the history of Christian persecution, to follow the Christians, from the first century of their establishment in this world, down to the present, and prove to you that the entertainment of this mistake relative to the nature of belief, has caused more crime, misery, and sorrow in the world, than almost all other causes put together. I will then go back again to the first century; and here, according

to St. Paul, we have them quarrelling, in the very first century that Christianity had an existence ; for he says, in the first chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, and the 11th and 12th verses,—“ For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them who are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you. Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul ; and I of Apollos ; and I of Cephas ; and I of Christ.” I will next refer you to the 3rd chapter and the 3rd verse :—“ For ye are yet carnal : for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men ?” Here then we find, that at the commencement of Christianity, there was, in the Christian church, as it existed in Corinth, according to the express declaration of St. Paul, divisions, strife, and envyings.

I will then take up the Ecclesiastical history in the second century, and prove to you, by the proceedings of these men, who called themselves Christians,—acting, mind you, all along, on these false principles as to the nature of belief,—that the very moment they got the least political power into their hands, that very moment they commenced, in the most violent and inhuman manner, to force the consciences of their fellow men. In the second century, a violent contention arose among the Christians, as to the particular day on which Easter was to be observed ; some would have it kept on one day, and some were for observing it on another. And the very moment that this contention arose, the very moment that a difference of opinion took place between them, that very moment they began to inflict pains and penalties upon each other ; for Victor, the Roman prelate of that time, excommunicated all the Eastern churches. Thus, between the churches of the East and the West, there was a mere difference of opinion as to the observance of a particular day ; and in consequence of that, what does Victor, the Roman prelate, do ? He excommunicates all the Eastern churches ; that is, he curses them, and denounces all communication with them. Thus you see, my friends, the religious feeling, existing as it

did in his mind, grounded on a mistake relative to human nature, caused him to tear asunder the bonds which unite society together. As Shakespeare truly remarks—

“One touch of Nature makes the whole world kin.”

But, while the whole family of man should have lived and acted in the bonds of brotherhood, this Roman prelate, in consequence of a difference of opinion, cuts off one half of the world from all sympathy with and feeling for their fellow-men. Thus, where *nature* had tied and bound the hearts of men together, *religion* has stepped in and severed that tie. It may be objected by my opponent, that it was not Christianity that did this, that it was not a true interpretation of the Scriptures. I have nothing to do with what any man may call Christianity; there are so many differences in the world as to what Christianity is, that I cannot allow any man to set himself up here as an infallible judge of what it is. I take the Testament, as it existed and operated upon the minds of the men to whom it was given. I am about to speak of its effect on them, and to trace that effect from that day down to the present.

Here, then, we find I have merely to give you this to work out my first statement: I have only to give you those particular deeds of oppression, in illustration of what I first laid down. I find, then, that during the reigns of Commodus, Severus, and Claudius, they excommunicated some for difference of opinion relative to the nature of Christ; but at that time, they had not in their power any means of persecuting; they could not take a man then and burn him; they could not imprison him for a particular opinion, because they themselves were not then tolerated in the Roman empire. All they could do was to hurl their anathemas upon his head; and we may take those curses, those anathemas, as indicative of the feelings which animated the men. I have only to say, that if they did not, at that time, burn men for their opinions, it was only because they had not the power, not because they lacked the inclination.

Mr. BARKER:—

Mr. Chairman, Friends,—Though I consider myself perfectly prepared to give a satisfactory interpretation to the passages which have been quoted, and to show that not one of them inculcates or sanctions the doctrine of persecution; I think it may not be the best way to notice these separate isolated passages in the first instance. In arguing upon the tendency of a system, it appears to me to be the most rational mode of proceeding, to take the system generally, the grand scope and drift,—the leading injunctions, examples, and principles which that system contains, and consider the probable influence of the whole. If we pursue this course on the present occasion, I have no doubt but the subject will be made perfectly plain to every intelligent person present, and that it will be manifest to all, that the doctrine and practice of persecution are as opposite to the doctrine and spirit of Christianity, as darkness is to light.

With respect to the doctrine of men's responsibility for their faith, it is no part of our business this evening to inquire whether it be true or false. That may be a subject for consideration hereafter, but at present, so far as that matter is concerned, my only business will be to show that the doctrine, that a man is responsible for his belief, as it is taught in the New Testament, is not adapted to inspire the spirit of persecution, or in any way to prompt those who believe it, to acts of cruelty towards their fellow men.

With respect to the doctrine of persecution, no individual that looks at the New Testament, and gives it a patient and candid reading through, can entertain the idea for a moment, that that book could ever make men persecutors. The first thing that strikes the reader, is the example of Jesus Christ, which is as far removed from the character of a bigot or a persecutor, as the tenderness of an angel is from the ferocity of a savage. The examples and instructions of the Apostles next present themselves; but there is nothing like persecution still. There are no threats of imprisonment, of fines, of despoiling of goods, or of death. All is meekness

and love. Paul, it is true, shall strike a sorcerer blind, when contending against him, and seeking to turn away his hearers from the faith; to prove to that sorcerer, and to those around, that his magic is impotent, and founded in delusion, but that the power which *he* possesses is from God, and that he can not only work miracles upon men generally, but even upon a sorcerer, who, according to the custom of the times, was attempting to demonstrate the falsehood of the Apostle's pretensions by the efforts of his own deceitful art. But nothing like unkindness seems to have entered into the spirit of either Christ or his Apostles. The judgment that fell upon Elymas was from the hand of God,—it was but “for a season;”—it was intended for his good, to cause him to cease from perverting the right ways of the Lord; and it was especially intended and adapted to convince, by the powerful evidence of a miracle, those whom the sorcerer sought to deceive, and so bring them to receive “the truth as it is in Jesus.” It had that effect; for when the deputy saw what was done, he believed; and it contributed, along with other singular miracles, to benefit the population of all the surrounding country.\*

With respect to another passage, “He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned,” my opponent says that not a word is here said about inquiry or evidence. I would observe, that something is said here both respecting inquiry, and respecting evidence. The first part of the passage is, “Go ye out into all the world, and preach the Gospel unto every creature.” If there was not inquiry on the part of those who received the Gospel, there was information on the part of those who preached it. Men were not called on to believe in something they knew not what; the whole Gospel was unfolded to them. Christ did, besides, inculcate inquiry. He called on men, “Take heed how ye hear,” “Search the Scriptures;” he wished them to examine and weigh all he said. With respect to evidence, how strange it was that Lloyd Jones should stumble upon the passage, “In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues,”† &c. and yet say that there was nothing said about evidence.

\* Acts xiii. 12,

† Mark xvi. 16, to the end.

"Lo, I am with you always," says Christ, working miracles by their means, as evidence of the truth of what they preached. Wherever the Gospel was preached, that evidence accompanied it; the Gospel came not in word only, but in demonstration of the Spirit and with power. It was on this account that they who heard it were called upon to give the more earnest heed to the things which they heard, because the Gospel was spoken unto them by the Lord himself, and was confirmed unto them by those that heard him, God also bearing them witness, both by signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost according to his own will. Heb. ii. 1—4. The facts and principles of the Gospel were plainly stated; the truth was adapted to the capacities of men; and the evidence also was just of that kind which was suited to that imperfect state of intelligence which then prevailed in the world. They were not called upon to believe against evidence, nor were they required to believe without it, but simply to receive those instructions and convictions which nothing but vicious dispositions and evil practices could hinder them from receiving.

With respect to persecution, I know not of one single passage in the whole of the New Testament that inculcates any such doctrine as that a man shall be persecuted by his fellow men, because he does not believe as his fellow men may dictate. On the contrary, the Scriptures teach us that every man is to judge for himself, (Luke xii. 57,) and no man is to dictate to another. Thess. v. 21. Rom. xiv. 2, 13—22. Matt. vii. 1—5. The Apostles themselves declare, that they "were not lords over men's faith, but helpers of their joy." 2 Cor i. 24. They never attempted to compel men to believe, or threatened to punish them if they did not believe. They stated the truth, they produced their evidence, and by the manifestation of the truth, commended themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. "If you will hear," said they, "you are happy; if you will not hear, the judgment of God awaits you: to your own master you must stand or fall."

Still it has been said by my opponent, that Chris-

Christianity has inspired the spirit of persecution, and that those who have professed the religion of Christ, have not failed to persecute from the first century to the present time. The Gospel could not inspire that spirit. If it could have inspired it in the minds of any, it would have inspired it in the minds of the Christian friends on this platform. The Gospel is now more generally read amongst us, more thoroughly understood, and more cordially believed by people generally, and it is received with fewer mixtures of superstitious, pagan, and infidel practices and principles, than at any former time since its first promulgation; yet where are the horrors of persecution? It does not astonish me, that, when the Gospel was received into minds not accustomed to pure truth,—minds that had been habituated from their youth to dictate opinions to others, and to persecute such as rejected them,—it does not astonish me that when it was at first received by princes, who had already been accustomed to enact and enforce laws against all strange gods, and all strange worship, punishing all innovations in religion with death,—we cannot wonder, I say, that when men like these first became favourable to Christianity, they should sometimes persecute. But the Gospel was not the cause of their persecutions; the Gospel forbade persecution. They brought the spirit of persecution into the church with them, they did not find it in Christianity. On the other hand, the reason why they did not persecute more was, that the Gospel in some degree counteracted the tendency of the persecuting systems to which they had formerly been subject, and which still, in some measure, remained within them.

I would now make an observation upon the passage quoted by my opponent from Titus iii. 9 :—"An heretic after the first and second admonition reject." This direction simply means, "let him be no longer considered a member of your society." There is no unkindness here: on the contrary, it was a kindness both to the man and to the church. By being admonished and disowned, many heretics were probably brought to consider their ways, and to renounce their errors and their wicked

practices; and it had a tendency to induce others to examine and to inquire into the matter, and to guard against the infection of the errors and evil practices of the heretics. For the heresies that are condemned in the New Testament, consisted more in bad conduct than in bad doctrine; they were new and false systems, quite opposite in doctrine and morals to the system of Christ, and were therefore inimical to the interests of the heretics themselves, and to the interests of the church at large. See Titus iii. 9, 10. Gal. i. 6, 7, 8, 9. Gal. v. 1, 4, 7, and forward. Rom. xvi. 17, 18.

As a further answer to what Lloyd Jones says about the tendency of Christianity to cause persecution, I would refer to a statement made by him in his opening speech. "I am glad," said he, "that the day of persecution is gone by, and that we can stand forth to advocate whatever sentiments we believe conducive to man's happiness, without fear." The day of persecution is in a great measure gone by, and we may thank Christianity for it. But the day of persecution had not gone by some years ago: two or three hundred years ago, persecution raged in our country with great violence. But at that time the Gospel was little known; copies of the Bible were scarcely any where to be found; there were not more than one or two in a whole parish, or a city, or very few more; and there were very few people, only one here and there, that had the power to read the Scriptures. But now the day of persecution is gone by, and yet the Gospel is now read by almost every child; it is preached from ten thousand pulpits; it is the subject of daily conversation; it is understood, believed, and practised more than in any former age of the church; and the consequence is, as my opponent has stated, "the day of persecution has gone by."

The two countries where there is the least persecution are America and England, and yet these are the two countries where the New Testament is more read, more fully understood, and more obeyed, than in any other countries in the world. The day of persecution has not gone by in Spain. What is the reason? The Gospel is little



known there. It has not gone by in Italy. What is the reason? The Gospel is there proscribed. It has not gone by in some more distant parts of the earth, as China, Hindostan, and Africa. How is that? The Gospel has not gone thither. Wherever the Gospel is made known and obeyed, persecution wanes; men's hearts imbibe a better spirit. They learn of Him who, when his disciples proposed to call down fire from heaven upon certain persons that would not suffer them to go through their village, rebuked them, and said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Luke ix. 51—56.

Jesus Christ gives his followers no power over other men's consciences; he declares that all are brethren. "The Gentiles," said he, "have their princes, and those that exercise authority over them; but it shall not be so among you: whosoever will be greatest among you; let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be the servant of all. He that will rise highest, let him stoop to the lowest offices of kindness, and become the servant and the helper of his brethren." Mat. xx. 20—28. Matt. xxiii. 1—12. Luke ix. 46. Luke xxii. 24—26. From all this it is as clear as possible, that Christ gives us no power over any man's conscience; and he assures us, that no such power shall be exercised among us, on pain of condemnation. "For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." Matt. xxiii. 12. Luke xii. 42—48. Well might the Apostle exclaim, when certain professors interfered with their brethren—"Why then dost thou judge thy brethren? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." Rom. ii. 1. and Rom. xiv. 10.

Who are they that are most forward to persecute at the present time? Are they those who are most forward in hearing and reading the Gospel of Christ? No. Are not *they* the great persecutors, who abhor the Gospel, and who wish to keep it from being read, and to shut up the Scriptures in a strange language? Persecuting bigots

dread the Gospel; it shakes them to the very soul. The man who sits on a throne based on the prostration of the consciences of his fellow-men, trembles if the New Testament comes into his country. For he knows that it opens men's eyes, that it teaches them their rights, and makes them wise, independent, and free.

The sect called Quakers attend more, perhaps, to the spirit and precepts of the Gospel, than any other denomination of Christians; and who are the persecutors among them? No such thing as persecution has any place in their system. So far from persecuting, they live every man free, without attempting to limit the freedom of others. It is true, if a man discredit their society by misconduct, they admonish him over and over again, and if he persist in his evil ways, they think it right to say, "He is no more a member of ours;" and very properly so. But they never go further; and is this persecution? (See Clarkson's Portraiture of Quakerism; their Book of Extracts, &c.)

I may further say, that the doctrine of responsibility for our belief, as taught in the Gospel, has no tendency whatever to make men persecutors. I believe that my brother is answerable to God for his faith, but what likelihood is there that that belief should make me persecute him? Just the contrary. The only influence such a sentiment could have on me, would be to induce me to use him kindly, and then leave him to God. We are expressly commanded to seek the good of others, but to seek it only by acts of kindness. The injunctions of the Gospel are that we should preach, and teach, and let our light shine in our good works, and use kindness and affectionate entreaty towards all, but nothing farther. The Apostle says, "The servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle and charitable unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose him; if God, peradventure, will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." 2 Tim. ii. 24, 25. The charity which the Christian writers inculcate is a charity "that suffereth long, and is kind; that envieth not; that vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave

itself unseemly, seeketh not her own interest or gratification, is never provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."\* It is even willing to die for the sake of another, but will never do evil that good may come.

What sort of characters those individuals were, respecting whose proceedings my opponent read his long and frightful extracts, I can scarcely tell; but of this I am certain, that they were persons who knew little of the New Testament, or who had little regard for its teachings. They disputed about the time of observing Easter, it seems; but what has this to do with Christianity? Where, in the New Testament, is the time of observing Easter mentioned? The nature of the dispute proves to me, that the contending parties were no true Christians. We are told by Lloyd Jones that those people had no power to imprison, or put to death, but that if they had had the power, they would have used it for those ends. Then this is another proof that they were no Christians; Christianity forbids all violence. Christianity requires us to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us, and teaches us, that instead of using force, we should meekly and kindly instruct all men; and this is the course true Christians pursue. Look at a few of those individuals who have received the Christian doctrine into their hearts. William Penn believed the Gospel, and he also held the doctrine that a man is accountable to God for his belief. But did he persecute? He bore himself the utmost indignities that his enemies could inflict upon him; he submitted to violence, and to fines and imprisonments, time after time; but he never lifted up a hand to persecute others. He founded the state of Pennsylvania; but what persecution was there there? Christianity was never tried on such a general scale in any other state; and what was the result? With the exception of one imperfect law, there was not a shadow of persecution in the whole code by which that state was governed. Christianity was believed and practised by Howard, by Boyle, by Newton, by Locke, by Wil-

\* 1 Cor. xiii. throughout.

berforce, by Clarkson, by Sturge ; were these men persecutors ? They believed that men were answerable for their faith, not to *them*, but to God ; and when they had advised and instructed men, they left them to God. Had they believed that other men were answerable to *them* for their belief, it might have operated as an inducement to persecute ; but Christianity had taught them that men were *not* answerable to them, nor to any other man on earth ; and they had, therefore, no inducement to persecution left.

A belief in the Scripture doctrine that a man is answerable to God for his faith, is calculated to have a happy rather than an unhappy effect upon the mind. We believe that men are responsible to God for their faith ; and what is the conclusion which we draw from this doctrine ? That it is our duty to teach them, to extend to them all the means of knowledge we are able to offer, to instruct, to give evidence, to use great gentleness, to endeavour in an affectionate way to remove their prejudices, and by all kind endeavours to strive to win them over to the truth, and not by violence drive them farther into error.

The doctrine of responsibility for belief, so far as it is taught in the passage—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned," is an article that is taught by every man. It is taught by the Socialists as much as it is taught in the passage just quoted. The Social institutions send out missionaries ; and what is their commission ? "Go into every town and preach the doctrine of Socialism to all the inhabitants ; those that believe them and enter the community shall be happy ; those who reject them will remain wretched." This is as much as Christ said, in the passage just quoted. There is no responsibility of man to his fellow man here, or in the whole New Testament ; the responsibility that the Gospel does teach, is of a kind that cannot cause persecution, but rather cause it to cease.

Mr. JONES :—

Friends,—Mr. Barker, in his discourse, did not deny

that the passages which I read to you existed in the Christian Scriptures; but he does deny that if the doctrines of persecution be drawn from them, they are justly interpreted. I have only to say, that if Mr. Barker be inclined to draw from them doctrines of charity, I am only sorry that Mr. Barker did not live a thousand years ago. Enlightened Christians *then* existed, and then persecuted, *because* they thought that those passages sanctioned it. He tells me there are passages of an opposite description in the Bible. I do not say there are not: it is not my business to reconcile discrepancies that may exist in the Testaments, not at all. I give you the passages as I read them, and I prove to you that Christians persecuted, that Christian men drew from these passages the doctrine of persecution, and quoted them to sanction such proceedings. No individual, he says, that looks at the Testament with a proper eye, can draw from it doctrines of this kind. I tell you that honest and sincere Christians did look at it with such eyes and understandings as they had, and did draw from it doctrines of persecution. I have not to deal with what Mr. Barker supposes may be drawn from these passages; I take them in their literal sense, and give you the conclusions that have been drawn from them.

Mr. Barker next alluded to the passage about the striking blind of Elymas, the sorcerer. Perhaps Paul acted very right; perhaps it was the power of God working through Paul to produce conviction in the mind of the sorcerer; but I say it would have been much better to have enlightened the man's understanding than to strike blind his eyes. He has made one slight mistake; and I do wish that Mr. Barker would pay particular attention to my language, that there may be no dispute about the words made use of. I did not state, as Mr. Barker has told you, that the day of persecution is gone by: I said that the day when personal injury was to be apprehended was gone by; that was my statement; but that the day of persecution has gone by I deny, and I will prove it. Those passages, Mr. Barker told you, where it is said "let a man be rejected," "let him be accursed," on account of his opinions,

could not mean persecution, nothing of the kind ; they merely meant that you should not have such a man in your society. This is certainly very charitable and very proper ; if you wish to attain a certain end, it would be foolish to encumber yourselves with him. But I am sorry to say that the Pope does not interpret them as Mr. Barker does ; and perhaps I shall be able to prove, before I have done, Mr. Barker *himself* does not always put that construction on those texts. They did persecute, he acknowledges, when fresh from Pagan superstitions ; but where the Gospel is known, he says, they do not persecute ; they persecute in Spain and Italy ; where it is not known ; but in England and America, where it *is* known, they do *not* persecute. I have only to say that, while the English Parliament was sitting to deliberate whether they should grant to the Roman Catholics their right to sit in the national councils or not, the Italian Pontiff had agreed to protect the Protestant worship in Rome ; and in America, with all its Christian light, not many years since, a nunnery was burned to the ground ; and yet here they have the advantage of the Bible.

But the Quakers, Mr. Barker has told you, do not persecute. Have I not driven Christianity into a narrow corner, when they are the only sect that he can bring forward to exemplify the truth of his principles—a sect, let me tell you, that cares the least about the Bible, and makes the least to do about it, of any ? He says Penn did not persecute : I know he did not. Howard did not persecute : I know he did not ; and I know there have been kind hearts, in every age, and in every country, whom no doctrines, however bad, were capable of rousing to such a degree as to cause them to persecute their fellow-men. I also know that there are temperaments and dispositions, amongst whom if a spark of wrong doctrine fell, they were immediately roused into violent and wicked action. Had all men's conduct been like that of Penn, I should have had never a word to say against these principles, except in so far as they had operated as an hinderance to their doing a greater amount of good. But, I say, there are dispositions whom no doctrines

could rouse into anger, and Penn's seems to have been one of them. But there were others existing at the same time with Penn, reformed Christians in America, who carried out persecution to a most alarming extent; and that I will prove.

I will now go on from where I broke off when my time was last up. I told you that during the reigns of Commodus-Severus, and Claudius, the Christians excommunicated one another, not on account of any dispute respecting the time when Easter was to be observed, but from a difference of opinion relative to the nature of Jesus Christ. Eusebins tells us that Theodorit, Sabellius, Paulus Samosatenus, Bishop of Antioch, and many others, were excommunicated because they held some heterodox doctrines relative to Jesus Christ. However, as I before remarked to you, then they could do nothing worse than excommunicate one another; that was all they had it in their power to do. Constantine at last succeeded to the throne; and he became a convert to the Christian religion. Now, I shall trace their proceedings from the time that they attained to power, from the period when they got the power to persecute into their own hands; and I shall prove that they exercised that power to a most frightful extent.

When Constantine became converted to the Christian religion, there were many differences of opinion existing among them, and those differences of opinion he found it impossible to allay. We find that one of his first acts after his conversion was to hinder the celebration of the Pagan worship: thus, in the very first instance, denying to his fellow-men—to the men who held the religion that he had just renounced, the power of exercising their right of worshipping according to the dictates of their conscience, and depriving them, in consequence of their belief, of the power to hold any situation or office in the state. I will read to you the passage; it is from Eusebius's Life of Constantine:—"As to the heathens, soon after the settlement of the whole empire under his government, he sent into all the provinces Christian presidents, forbidding them, and all other officers of superior dignity,

to sacrifice, and confining to such of them as were Christians, the honour due to their characters and stations; thereby endeavouring to support the kingdom of Christ, which is not of this world, by motives purely worldly, namely, the prospect of temporal honours. And notwithstanding the excellent law he had before published, that every one should have free exercise of his own religion, and worship such gods as they thought proper, he soon after prohibited the old religion, namely, the worship of idols in cities and in the country, commanding that no statues of the gods should be erected, nor any sacrifices offered upon their altars."

Here, then, we have them, from the first moment that they received power into their hands, exercising that power for depriving their fellow-citizens of their rights as citizens, because they differed from them in their belief. But the first grand difference that took place among the Christians was caused by a man named Arius. He was presbyter to Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria; and he conceived some notion relative to the nature of Christ different from that entertained by his bishop, Alexander. In consequence of this, a general council took place between the whole of them. I will read you the passage wherein the nature of this difference is stated, that you may see what beautiful things we, who call ourselves rational creatures, sometimes differ about. Alexander's doctrine, that is, the bishop's, as Arius represents it, in his letter to Eusebius of Nicodemus, was this:—"God is always, and the Son always: the same time the Father, the same time the Son. The Son co-exists with God unbegottenly, being ever begotten, being unbegottenly begotten. That God was not before the Son, no, not in conception, or the least point of time, he being ever God, ever a Son: for the Son is out of God himself." That is Alexander's doctrine. Now here is Arius's, in opposition to it:—"That there was a time when there was no Son of God, and that he who before was not, afterwards existed; being made, whenever he was made, just as any man whatever; and that therefore he was of a mutable nature, and equally receptive of vice and virtue."



Now, my friends, this was the entire ground-work of their quarrel, which completely split up the Christian church into two grand divisions. I will read another passage, from Dr. Chandler's History of Persecutions, edited by Atmore, both Christian men; for I am not giving you any infidel account of those transactions; I am condemning Christians out of the mouths of Christians themselves:—"The *bishops* of each side had already interested the people in their quarrel, and *heated* them into such a *rage*, that they *attacked* and *fought with*, *wounded* and *destroyed* each other, and *acted with such madness as to commit the greatest impieties for the sake of Orthodoxy*; and arrived to that pitch of insolence as to offer great indignities to the imperial images. The old controversy about the time of celebrating Easter being now revived, added fuel to the flames, and rendered their animosities too furious to be appeased." In consequence of this we find Constantine, immediately after he arrived at the imperial dignity, was forced to call a council, which was the first general council in the Christian church, to decide whether Arius or Alexander was right, and to take some decisive steps to put a stop to the proceedings I have read to you; for you hear that they had attacked, fought, wounded, and destroyed each other. He then called the Council of Nice, in Bithynia, in the year 325, at which there were no less than 318 bishops, a vast number of presbyters, deacons, acolythists, and so forth. Now, one would naturally suppose, that when this number of Christian men had met together, there would have been something like Christian charity existing among them, and that, according to Mr. Barker's opinion of the matter, they would have gone moderately and mildly to work, and have endeavoured to set each other right. Well, we shall see.

Theodorit says—"Those of the Arian party were *subtle and crafty*, and like shelves under water, concealed their *wickedness*." This, mind you, was when they were met in council. "Amongst the orthodox party," he adds, "some were of a *quarrelling, malicious temper*, and accused several of the bishops; and they presented their

accusatory libels to the emperor." Socrates says that "very many of them, the major part of them, accused one another; and that many of them, the day before the emperor came to the council, had delivered in to him libels of accusations, or petitions against their enemies." Sozomen goes farther, and tells us, "that as it usually comes to pass, many of the priests came together, that they might contend earnestly about their own affairs, thinking they had now a fit opportunity to redress their grievances, and that every one presented a libel to the emperor, of the matter of which he accused others, enumerating his particular grievances. And that this happened almost every day." Gelasius Cyzicenus's account of them is, "that when all the bishops were gathered together, according to custom, there happened many debates and contentions amongst the bishops, each one having matters of accusation against the other. Upon this they gave in libels of accusation to the emperor, who received them; and when he saw the quarrels of such bishops with one another, he endeavoured to conceal the wicked attempts of such bishops from the knowledge of those without doors." Sabinus also says—"They were generally a set of very ignorant men, and destitute of knowledge and learning." Here, then, we have them, at the very foundation, quarrelling about a metaphysical piece of nonsense of the most absurd description. Here we have them, with all the charity of ministers of God and of the established religion, because Arius differed from his bishop, hunting him like a wild beast, and bringing accusations against one another. I will now read you the edict of Constantine against Arius and his followers, as given in an old edition of the "Ancient Ecclesiastical History," translated by Dr. Hanmer, and published in 1585:—

"Constantinus the puissant, the mighty and noble Emperor unto the bishops, pastors, and people wheresoever. Inasmuch as Arius traceth the steps of detestable and impious persons: it is requisite that he be partaker with them of the self same infamy and reproach. For as Porphyrius, the sworn adversary and deadly foe of divine service, who lately published lewd commentaries, in the confutation and defiance of Christian religion, *was rewarded*

*according unto his desert, and so recompensed that within the compass of these few years he was not only grieved with great reproach, and blemished with the shameful spot of infamy, but also his impious and blasphemous works, perished and utterly were abolished; even so now it seemed good unto us to call Arius and his complices, the wicked brood of Porphyrius, that look whose manners they have imitated, they may enjoy also the privilege of their name. Moreover we thought good, that if there can be found extant any work or book compiled by Arius, the same should be burned to ashes, so that not only his damnable doctrine may thereby be wholly rooted out: but also that no relique thereof may remain unto posterity. This also we straightly command and charge, that if any man be found to hide or conceal any book made by Arius, and not immediately bring forth the said book, and deliver it up to be burned, that the said offender for so doing, shall die the death. For as soon as he is taken, our pleasure is that his head be stricken off from his shoulders. God keep you in his tuition."*

So finishes this denunciation.

Mr. BARKER:—

My Friends,—There is one part of the foregoing speech in which I perfectly agree, it is the testimony given respecting the character of those persecutors who met in the council of Nice, namely, that they were generally a set of ignorant men, and destitute of true knowledge and learning. Ignorant generally, I should imagine, but above all things ignorant of the Gospel of Christ; the system which all true Christians love, and preach, and practise. That testimony respecting the ignorance of those contentious and quarrelsome men, exactly agrees with what the Apostle said respecting the contentious and quarrelsome members of the church at Corinth:—"And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. For ye are yet carnal; for whereas there are among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" 1 Cor. iii. 1—3. They walked not as Christians, but as carnal, unregenerated men. Full grown Christians would have acted differently: they would have walked in all meekness and charity, peacefully instructing those who might be in error, if by any means they might recover them from the snare of the

Devil, who were led captive by him at his will. It was not because they were Christians that they did wrong, but because they were not sufficiently Christians,—because they were only *babes* in Christ.

There was also a contradiction in the last speech. Those persecutors were “enlightened, honest, and sincere Christians,” my opponent said, but he never attempted to prove them such. His historians say that they were quarrelsome and violent, and a set of ignorant and unlearned men ; and the whole case proves that the statement of the historians is the true one. “Honest and sincere Christians!” It seems, then, that Lloyd Jones can read the hearts of men for sixteen hundred years back. Why, this man is fit to be the judge of the universe. “Honest and sincere Christians” they could not be, or they would have trod in the steps of their master, and attended to his instructions, who forbade his disciples to persecute, and who told them, when they were disposed to persecute, according to those old systems which Christianity came to sweep away,—“Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.”

“My kingdom is not of this world,” said Christ ; and he would not allow his people to use any of this world’s weapons. “If I were an earthly king,” said he, “my servants should fight ; but I am simply the ruler of men’s minds, the teacher of truth, and truth and charity are the only weapons I allow.” We, therefore, his followers, teach the truth ; if men believe it, we rejoice, and are happy ; if they receive it not, though they persecute us, and even take and hang us, we can only weep and pray over them. This is the example left us by our Master. They persecuted him, but he made no resistance ; and when they hung him on a cross, the severest expression that fell from his lips was—“Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.” Luke xxiii. 34. Stephen was a Christian, both “enlightened and sincere ;” and he exemplified the same spirit as his Master. “They stoned Stephen, calling on the name of the Lord ; and he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this he fell asleep.” Acts viii. 59, 60. Ten thousand thousand Chris-

tians have gone to the cross with similar composure, and died without uttering a reviling word. They have wept for those who were about to destroy them; and it was the meekness with which they suffered, the freedom with which they shed their blood, in order to gain admission for the truth into men's hearts, that made even infidels and idolators say—"Truly, these men are the sons of the living God." Their blood, so meekly and charitably shed for the salvation of their enemies, was the seed of the church. Such was the influence of their disinterestedness, their unearthly courage, and their spirit of self-sacrifice for the good of their fellow men, over the beholders, that it overwhelmed the hearts of thousands, and brought them over to the cause of truth.

Not so with those persecutors of which we have heard from Lloyd Jones. They were ignorant of the Gospel, as Lloyd Jones's historian tells us, or they could never have written such stuff as we have heard read over. If they had understood the Gospel, it would have taught them better than to dispute about such follies. I love the Gospel; I wish Lloyd Jones would read out of the Gospel. We should then hear a severe sentence against useless disputes and strifes about words. We should hear the ministers of Christ exhorted to follow after righteousness, charity, peace, and things by which we might edify one another; to avoid foolish and unlearned questions, knowing that they engender strife, and increase unto more ungodliness. We should find them cautioned not to give heed to false and endless genealogies, and commanded to refuse profane and old wives' fables, and to exercise themselves rather unto godliness. See 1 Tim. i. 4, 5. and iv. 7, 8. and vi. 4, 20. 2 Tim. ii. 14, 16, 23. Tit. i. 14. and iii. 9. &c. If we read the New Testament, we shall be convinced that those men were unacquainted with the Gospel, or else did not regard it; or the Gospel would have found them better employment. The Gospel would have taught them, that the business of a Christian is to learn his Father's will, and do it. It would have taught them to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.

It would have told them to remember the Good Samaritan, who pitied even the Jew in his distress that would have called him a dog,—who parted with his oil and wine, got off his own beast, and set the wounded man thereon, took him to an inn, expended his money and his time, and could not rest till he had seen him in a fair way to be safe and happy. It would have told them to remember the Good Samaritan, and bid them “Go and do likewise.” *This* is the doctrine of the Gospel; “As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially to those who are of the household of faith.” Gal. vi. 10. “Pure religion before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep ourselves unspotted from the world.” James i. 27. “As you would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.” If a man smite us, to pray for him; if we receive evil, to return good; never to revenge ourselves, but to suffer meekly; to love as brethren; to be pitiful and courteous; not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing; to commit our cause into the hands of Him that judgeth righteously; never to be overcome of evil, but to overcome evil with good. See Matt. v. 38—48. Rom. xii. 1—21. 1 Pet. iii. 8—17. and all through the New Testament.

With respect to Constantine, we are told by Lloyd Jones that he persecuted. He acted then in accordance with the spirit and laws of the Roman empire, at the head of which he was placed. There never was an age of which we have any account, when persecution was not the law of the Roman empire. From the infancy of the empire up to the time of Constantine, laws were regularly enacted against all new religions, and officers were appointed to see them enforced; and when those officers did not prove efficient, other officers, of a higher order, were directed to see that those persecuting laws were put in execution, and that a system of uniformity might be secured. And they did enforce those laws. They threw down the temples erected to other gods; they hunted and banished or destroyed the Jews; they persecuted the

Christians beyond all bounds. Look how they suffered under the emperors that preceded Constantine; not less than two millions of them put to death, simply for their religion.\*

Persecution, then, was the law of the Roman empire; the laws enjoining persecution were innumerable. Constantine was brought up under those laws, he was taught to regard them as right, and he was placed at the head of the empire to execute them. He did execute them to some extent, and in so doing he acted in accordance with the spirit of the unchristian world. But mark you, when Constantine became a Christian, as my opponent admits, he passed a law forbidding persecution, and granting to all men liberty to worship according to their own consciences. It was Christianity that taught him to pass this law. The first law against persecution, the first law that was ever passed in Rome for such an object, was passed by the first emperor that professed to embrace Christianity. There was no other system in the world but Christianity, that could have led him to pass such a law. But it is said that he afterwards revoked this law: it is not surprising; he acted throughout just like a man who had learned something of the Gospel, but who had not learned it perfectly. I honour Constantine for the good he did; I am very sorry that he was not perfect. I would not execrate him, because he happened not to be a good scholar as soon as he got into Christ's school. It would have been strange if he had unlearned all his Pagan lessons at once. Considering his circumstances, he did well; I am only sorry that he did not drink deeper into the Christian spirit, that he might have stood at the head of the empire, an example of all goodness and excellence at once.

The charges, then, which Lloyd Jones has brought against Christianity from the conduct of the men that assembled at the Council of Nice, and the conduct of Constantine, fall to the ground. They prove nothing

\* See Livy, B. 9, No. 30, B. 25, No. 5, B. 39, No. 16; Valerius Maximus, Book 4; Dion. Cassius, Book 42 and 54; Tacitus Annals, Book 2, No. 85; See Jews' Letters to Voltaire.

against Christianity whatever. The contentious and trifling members of the council were *not* Christians; they could not be; Lloyd Jones cannot prove them to have been Christians; the character which he himself has given of them proves that they were no such thing. And as for Constantine, his whole case is in favour of Christianity. When he had become partially a Christian, he passed the best laws that had ever been passed up to that time, by any mere ruler of this world, since the world began. Let this be remembered to his honour, and to the honour of the New Religion.

No doubt there were many persons eager to get money, and anxious to obtain power, clustering round Constantine at the time he embraced Christianity, who would be ready to do anything or to recommend anything to Constantine that seemed likely to further their ends. These might call themselves Christians, and they might be persecutors; but they were not Christians indeed, or they would have been better minded. There might be statesmen around Constantine, imbued more with the spirit of the old intolerant laws of the empire, than with the spirit of Christianity, who would prompt him to persecute; but the mass of Christians, the great multitudes of Christians then living, and every generation of Christians up to that time, used no violence.\* Indeed they were against the use of violence altogether; and one charge that used to be brought against them by their enemies was, that they would not fight nor bear arms. They were reproached with being enemies to the commonwealth, because they refused either to bear arms, or enter into government offices. This was the conduct of the better kind of professing Christians from the first.

But if we should find a great many imperfections among the Christians of those early times, we need not wonder. They had not the best opportunities of obtaining a knowledge of Christian principles. There were no printing presses then, and very few copies of the New Testament writings: so that the people generally had to

\* We refer to Mosheim's and Milner's Church Histories, &c. in proof of these statements.



take their instruction from the lips of their teachers. And many of their teachers had been bred up in infidelity and idolatry, both of them systems of a persecuting character. And when Christianity became fashionable, many were forward to become teachers for gain, who were not well instructed themselves. If, therefore, violence crept into the church, it was all natural; but no blame attaches to the Gospel. Ignorant or hypocritical men brought persecution with them into the church; they did not find it there. They added it to the Gospel; it was no part of the Gospel itself. And the prevailing ignorance of the times favoured this degeneracy. But when at length the printing press unfolded the Gospel, and allowed all men to read its teachings, and discover its beauties, a mighty change was effected. Men learned that persecution, as well as profligacy and lying, belonged to the world, the flesh, and the devil; and that kindness, forbearance, charity, and meekness were the characteristics of the true followers of Jesus Christ: and from that day to this, as the knowledge of the Gospel has been spread abroad, and as its principles have been received and reduced to practice, the horrors and cruelties of persecution have passed away,

Again: the unfairness of representing persecution as originating in the doctrines of Christianity, is plain enough from this; that persecution has been practised, and is practised still, by individuals utterly opposed to Christianity. Diderot, one of the leading infidels of France, rejected the Gospel altogether, and was a believer in the Socialist doctrine that man is not at all responsible either for his belief or conduct. He was the father of Robert Owen's system, Lycurgus might be its grandfather: and he taught that the man who murdered another man was no more to blame than a whirlwind. Yet this man, who did not believe that men were responsible at all, still taught that men should be persecuted. "They who do wrong," said he, "ought to be punished, not because they deserve it, but to furnish good circumstances or motives to others, to prevent them from doing wrong." On this same principle the Socialists can perse-

cute ; this has been done by them, and they are prepared to carry out the principle to a famous extent, as soon as they have the opportunity. I was reading a work of Robert Owen's lately, in which he says that "the Socialists must all learn the use of arms," must all be soldiers, skilled in "the destructive art," taught the manual exercise, the use of fire-arms, and made to understand and practise the more complicated military movements. This is to be the law of every community, and the plan is to be carried to its farthest possible extent, says Robert Owen ; for though men are not responsible for their opinions and acts, yet so long as *any part* of mankind shall be irrational, that is, so long as any remain Christians, unconverted to infidelity and Socialism, it will be necessary, even for the most rational, to be thus armed, that they may *over-rule* the actions of the irrational beings, maintain the peace, and, if possible, cure them of their errors. Robert Owen, then, if he should live, is to be the last soldier in the universe ; the Socialists are to be the last in arms—the last fighting men on earth. As long as there are any men that reject their system, they are to be in arms to overrule the Christians, and, if possible, convert them. And these are the men that would charge all persecution and violence on Christianity. "But," say the Socialists, "we are to bear arms and fight in self-defence and to keep the peace." But all men justify their arming on this ground : all arm in self-defence, if we are to believe them ; all nations go to war for the sake of peace. This plea is no more than any statesman can make use of.

D'Alembert was not a Christian, he was as thorough an infidel as any Socialist ; yet he also was a persecutor. He cursed and swore because the Censor of the press in France refused to suppress the writings of his adversary. "It is curious to see this chief of the infidel sect," as his biographer observes, "thus early attempting persecution, and using the first opportunity of power which he obtained, in violating those principles of liberty about which he had made such outcries, by seeking to suppress the writings of his opponents." The Censor of the press

wrote D'Alembert a kind and prudent answer ; but he tore the letter to pieces in a rage, and cursed its author. Persecution, therefore, is not confined to professing Christians, nor to those who hold the doctrine of the voluntary nature of belief, and that men are responsible for their opinions. It belongs to man ; it is a part of his animal nature ; and until men are regenerated by the power of Christian principle, they must be persecutors.

As to those long stories read to us about deeds of persecution, they are to no purpose. We know them all. They were Christian authors who told Lloyd Jones about those things ; but did they charge them on the Gospel ? We know better : they mentioned them to show how imperfectly Christianity was understood and practised in those times, and they took care to leave it on record, that the persecutors were ignorant and unlearned men. When Christianity takes possession of all men's hearts, there can be no persecution. It is taking hold of men's hearts now ; its influence is spreading in all directions ; and persecution is passing away. Thank God, Christianity is not driven into a corner, and confined to the Quakers ; it is professed, and in some measure practised by a hundred sects in different parts of the world ; and all of them, in proportion as they respect the Gospel, are ever opposed to persecution. It is said that the Quakers regard the Scriptures least of any sect : it is just the opposite, I believe. They read them daily ; and, with the works of their early Friends, they are almost their only books. No man in his days seemed mightier in the Scriptures than George Fox, the founder of the Quakers ; no man could so readily baffle his persecutors, and show that the religion of Christ was a religion of peace, and that it did not sanction the use of violence. Penn, who founded the state of Pennsylvania, and those other Friends who went thither to cultivate the wilderness and found an asylum from the rage of their enemies, have proved, along with the better part of the Christian world generally, that the principles of the Gospel are principles of peace.

But Lloyd Jones says, "Your Parliament" did so and

so; it is no parliament of ours, any more than of Lloyd Jones's; nor are we, or Christianity either, answerable for its acts. "Your parliament!" Go to our leaders, our monthly and quarterly meetings; our yearly assemblies and conferences, these are *our* parliaments; and see if you can find any persecuting laws in their acts: or rather, go to the Gospel, that is our book,—see what persecuting laws are there. You will find no such thing. Parliament passed the Catholic Emancipation Bill. Why? Because public feeling, generated in the hearts of Christian people, forced it upon them. They have passed many an Emancipation Bill; because Christianity had so impregnated and strengthened public feeling in favour of liberal measures, that they were compelled to yield to its force, and support the cause of humanity. Out of respect to the feelings of a people in some measure Christianized, parliament was obliged to say—Let the oppressed go free; and the yoke of oppression and persecution was shivered and scattered, like dust, to the winds. I maintain, then, and I have proved it already, that the Gospel system is a system of love, of mercy, and of gentleness throughout.

Mr. JONES :—

My Friends,—Mr. Barker, at the commencement of his address, took an objection to my stating that the parties who persecuted in the early ages of the churches, were honest and sincere Christians. I hold it as a general rule, that never can admit of a question, that the majority of all bodies of men are honest; and I say again, that where 318 bishops were met in council, with a multitude of presbyters, deacons, and the like—I maintain that, even *there*, the majority of these men, were honest, but were guided by evil principles. I say they may have been illiterate or ignorant, but that does not destroy their honesty and good intentions. He has drawn you a picture of the meekness of Christians: even if you nail them to the cross, they will say—"Father, forgive them, they know not what they do." If you smite them, they will not smite again; if you curse them, they will not

curse again. "Why, my friends, I thought the gentleman was reading a chapter from the Arabian Nights' Entertainments, or some fairy vision, some "midsummer night's dream." Has it any existence in reality? Every one of you knows in his heart it is a hollow mockery; it is a libel, a mockery on your proceedings. Instead of walking in meekness, and turning the other cheek to those that smite you,—instead of refraining from cursing and smiting, you are doing nothing but cursing and smiting and injuring. Oh, but the Parliament—they granted Catholic Emancipation, when the demand was made by Christian people upon them! Yes, when the Roman Catholics, who were demanding entrance into the offices of the state, took up a threatening position, the Duke of Wellington granted it, more as a matter of expediency than of right, as he said himself. And let me tell Mr. Barker, that when they did take up that stand, the Methodists were petitioning against it: I saw, in the porch of their chapel door in Oldham-street, a petition against Catholic Emancipation. So that, instead of a Christian people demanding the concession from a Christian legislature, they were encouraging them in persecution and oppression, with all the Christian feeling in their Christian bosoms.

But Constantine passed good laws: I know he did; he passed good laws when he first became a Christian; but, you see, the longer he remained in the Christian school, the worse he became. I say he was a persecutor: I believe he was sincere, and I pity him equally with Mr. Barker; but I say it is right to condemn the false principles that led him astray. I believe the majority of persecutors, in every age, and every country, were honest men, but ignorant, in relation to the principles on which they grounded their persecutions. I will now proceed with my history of persecution. Mr. Barker knows it all: to be sure he does; you all know it all; aye, but I will tell it you again. You do not know it all: you do not know the foundation which your religion had; you do not know the manner in which it has passed over the world, the desolations, heart-burnings, and miseries

which it has caused. I do not attribute this,—I tell you again,—to dishonesty on the part of the men who persecuted ; but I attribute it to their being guided by false conceptions of human nature ; and that false conceptions exist in the New Testament, I have proved by reading the passage. We find, then, that Arius was banished by a decree of the council of Nice ; but Arius had a multitude of followers, who were as determined to support his opinions, as the orthodox party were to support theirs ; and wherever they went, the one would not give way to the other.

I will now read you Athanasius's account of the proceedings of Arius. He says, when exclaiming against the cruelty of the Arians—" Whom have they not used with the greatest indignity that they have been able to lay hold of? Who hath ever fallen into their hands, that they have had any spite against, whom they have not so cruelly treated, as either to murder or to maim him? What place is there where they have not left the monuments of their barbarity?" " The Arians also, in their turn, used the orthodox with no greater moderation than the orthodox had used them. The Vandals, who were partly Pagans, and partly Arians, had seized on Spain and Africa, and exercised innumerable cruelties on those who were not of the same religion with themselves." Mind you, I am not giving you the conduct of these different religious bodies only as such conduct was the result of a difference of opinion on religion ; it is their religious history I am giving. " Trasimond, their general in Spain, and Genseric, in Africa, used all possible endeavours to propagate Arianism throughout all their provinces. And, the more effectually to accomplish this design, they filled all places with slaughter and blood, by the advice of the bishops of their party, burning down churches, and putting the orthodox clergy to the most grievous and unheard of tortures, to make them discover the gold and silver of their churches, repeating these kind of tortures several times, so that many actually died under them. Genseric seized on all the sacred books he could find, that they might be deprived of the

means of defending their opinions. By the counsel of his bishops, he ordered that none but Arians should be admitted to court, or employed in any offices about his children, or so much as enjoy the benefit of a toleration. Armogestes, Masculon, and Satorus, three officers of his court, were inhumanly tortured to make them embrace Arianism; and upon their refusal, they were stripped of their honours and estates, and forced to protract a miserable life in the utmost poverty and want."

I will now show you that the orthodox party, to whom Arius was opposed, hesitated not in inflicting the worst injuries upon the Arians. Athanasius, who was the man who before complained of the persecutions of the Arians, (and of whom I may here remark, that he was only an enemy of persecution when it was directed against himself and his followers, but was a particular friend to it when directed against those who stood opposed to him,)—in his letter to Epictetus, bishop of Corinth, says—"I wonder that your piety hath suffered these things (i.e. the heresies he had before mentioned), and that you did not immediately put those heretics under restraint, and propose the true faith unto them; that if they would not cease to contradict, they might be declared heretics; for it is not to be endured that these things should be either said or heard among Christians." And in another place he says that "they ought to be had in universal hatred for opposing the truth;" and comforts himself that the Emperor, upon due information, would put a stop to their wickedness, and that "they would not be long-lived." The Emperor Julian, who was *first* a Christian, and afterwards became a Pagan, and who was one of the best emperors that ever reigned in Rome, makes this declaration when commenting upon the conduct of the Christians: he says that "he found, by experience, that even beasts are not so cruel to men as the generality of Christians were to one another."

[Before going any further, I would here make one remark on something which Mr. Barker said, which had slipped my memory. He speaks of the principles of Diderot, of D'Alembert, and of Robert Owen recom-

mending men to become soldiers. Now, we have nothing to do with those individuals to-night; we are speaking of Christians to-night; with their proceedings and the influence of their principles I have to deal, and from that Mr. Barker shall not stir me. I am ready to meet him on the other question at any other time, if he thinks proper.]

Under the emperors Theodosius and Honorius, the Donatists gave sad specimens of their cruelty in Africa towards the orthodox, as St. Austin informs us. "They seized on Maximianus, one of the African bishops, as he was attending at the altar, beat him unmercifully, and ran a sword into his body, leaving him near dead." And a little after he adds that "it would be tedious to recount the many horrible things they made the bishops and clergy suffer: some had their eyes put out; one bishop had his hands and tongue cut off; and others were cruelly destroyed." Oh, but, according to Mr. Barker, this was all the result of the influence of pagan principles, which then contaminated the Christianity these parties had. Ah! but pause a while, Mr. Barker; I will come lower down, and will show you that your brethren in America were not the good, forgiving, forbearing people you said they were, but that they made laws which I will show you were a refinement in cruelty on those of the Romans, and that they were more violent persecutors. I will prove, also, that the founder of the Methodist religion, John Wesley himself, was a persecutor; I will trace the progress of persecution down to the present day, and prove that blood, blood, misery, and oppression, mark it all the way down. St. Cyril,—*a saint*, mark you,—who was Bishop of Alexandria, in opposition to the prefect of that place, Orestes, took from the Jews their synagogues, deprived them of that toleration which the Roman governor was anxious to give, banished them from the city, and encouraged the mob to plunder their effects. This the prefect highly resented; he would not succumb to the authority of St. Cyril. What was the result? This good, *pious* bishop, who put an end to toleration among the Jews, so anxious was he that the true faith alone should prevail, that



Orestes, the governor, was attacked by the Christians, beaten with sticks, and wounded; and a woman, out of envy of her superior skill in philosophy, was brutally murdered.

I will here draw your attention to the state of feeling which existed among the Christians. Suppose for a moment, (and here I address myself particularly to the women) that some woman, feeling strongly the truth of the doctrines she had embraced, and possessing a powerful mind, should go about the world teaching those doctrines; who will say that for this she ought to be murdered? Yet we find that this was the case with Hypatia, a follower of the Platonic system of philosophy; and so strongly were the Christians excited at her, that, as she was returning home from a visit, one Peter, a clergyman, with some other murderers, seized on her, dragged her out of her chariot, and carried her to one of the churches, stripped her naked, scraped her to death with shells, then tore her to pieces, and burnt her body to ashes. These things, according to Socrates, took place in the ember days; he reproaches Christian men for being guilty of such conduct, and says they brought great infamy on the church by their violent proceedings.

Before the schism created by Arius had subsided, another arose, to add fresh fuel to the fire: it was called the heresy of Nestorius. His great crime was, that he would not consent to call the Virgin Mary the mother of God; he considered it not right that she should be called the mother of God; and I will read to you the proceedings that took place when that dreadful crime was brought to light. "Mary was a woman," he says, "therefore God could not be born of her;" adding, "I cannot call him God who once was not above two or three months old;" and therefore he substituted another word in the room of it, calling her "mother of Christ." This would not be tolerated; it was deemed a frightful heresy; and immediately upon this, a council was again called of the bishops, to decide whether Mary was the mother of God or of Christ. This was certainly a matter of vast importance; bishops,

presbyters, and deacons, called from all parts of the country, met at Ephesus, to settle whether Nestorius was right or wrong. The decision of the council of Ephesus was, that the bishops and clergymen who held the opinion of Nestorius should be expelled from the churches, and that the laymen should be excommunicated. "This was the occasion of *irreconcilable hatreds* amongst the bishops and people, who were so enraged against each other, that there was no passing with any safety from one province or city to another; because every one pursued his neighbour as his enemy; and," mind you, friends, "revenged themselves on one another, under a pretence of ecclesiastical zeal." It is all very well for Mr. Barker to say that this is a mistake, and that we shall not find these things in the Gospel. But I say the story of the Miraculous Conception is in the Gospel; and in the state of mind which existed at that time, the world did not properly understand those things; and, not knowing the structure of the human mind, they quarrelled, and persecution followed. Now, it is impossible that persecution can flow from difference of convictions, because we know how those convictions are formed. Instead of striking a man blind, because he does not view things in the same light as we do, it is our duty to lay such evidence before his mind as may lead him to change his views. This is the rational mode of doing the thing,—a mode which the Gospel does not teach; I had nothing to do with the discrepancies of the Gospel.

Mr. BARKER :—

It has been twice insinuated that there are discrepancies in the New Testament; there are no such things as discrepancies in the Gospel from beginning to end. That is not the subject for discussion this evening; but I am prepared to prove the statement at a proper time,—that the New Testament contains no discrepancies; but that its teachings, from end to end, are all in perfect agreement. From first to last, the doctrine of the Gospel is—"Blessed are the lowly-minded, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;" "Blessed are the meek—(those who will bear injuries and persecutions themselves, but

not inflict them on others)—for they shall inherit earth ;”  
 “ Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy ;”  
 “ Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the children of God. <sup>b</sup> Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that spitefully use you and persecute you ; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven : for he maketh the sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. Be ye, therefore, perfect and merciful, even as your Father which is in heaven is merciful.” Matt. v. 3, 5, 7, 9, 44, &c. “ Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls.” Matt. xi. 28, &c.

I will take the liberty to read to you a few passages more out of the New Testament ; I may take this liberty the more readily, as Lloyd Jones seems resolved to lay the New Testament aside altogether :—“ Let him that stole, steal no more ; but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice ; and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you. Be ye therefore followers or imitators of God as dear children, and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.” Ephes. iv. 28—32, v. 1, 2. The advice which St. Paul gives to the bishops and deacons is of the same character : they must be no strikers, nor brawlers, nor wrathful, but sober, just, meek, patient, ready to instruct, examples of righteousness, love, charity, peace, using all kind and prudent methods to open the understandings of men, to gain a reception for the truth, and so to present evidences of the truth to their minds, that rational conviction may follow. This was the course enjoined on all the ministers

of the church of Christ in the earliest times, and this was the course which they pursued.

But the description which I gave in my former speech of the character of true Christians, is a mere picture, Lloyd Jones says. The picture is drawn from reality, thanks be to God. There are thousands and tens of thousands such Christians at the present time, and there have been such Christians from the day that Christ first founded a church upon earth to the present time. Christianity has not been inefficient : it has done wonders. It has been like a light shining in a dark world : it could not at once chase away all the mists and shadows of error and persecuting doctrine, but it rolled back and chased away great portions of them. And it still shines ; and wherever its bright beams fall, the darkness of error and cruelty is quickly dispersed. Whatever darkness has surrounded it, or seemed to mingle with it, belonged to the corrupt and persecuting systems of the world ; whatever light and happy influences have mingled with the systems of the world, checking and destroying their bloody and persecuting spirit, came from the Gospel ; it did not originate with the world.

But we are doing nothing at present, says Lloyd Jones, but cursing and smiting one another, and shedding one another's blood : blood, blood, blood, is still the history of our doings. Whatever world has Lloyd Jones come from ? There is nothing answering his picture of blood where I live. I hear no cursing Christians ; I see no deeds of blood. I hear nothing but the accents of peace and charity. I hear the voice of praise and prayer ; I heard Lloyd Jones himself meekly and affectionately prayed for this day, and this is the spirit that animates the circle in which I move. They are pleading the cause of the slaves, and labouring to sweep the system of slavery from the earth : they are uniting to effect a temperance reformation, and banish drunkenness from human society. *Christians* are not shedding blood : *true* Christians cannot shed blood. Christians are employed in better things. They are building Sunday schools, and extending the benefits of education to the

rising generation; which those persons who reject the Gospel, and renounce the doctrine of responsibility, never did. They are spreading the blessings of education through the whole earth, sending Bibles and other useful books into all parts of the world, translating books and tracts into one hundred and fifty different languages, making new alphabets for uncultivated tribes, constructing new languages, and endeavouring to impart the truth and blessings of salvation to all the inhabitants of the earth. The Christians of England and America are at this moment preparing to place a copy of the Sacred Scriptures in the hands of every man on earth, and to furnish along with it the means to enable every one to read and understand it. We have our hospitals also, our infirmaries, and our asylums for the blind, the dumb, and the destitute, and public charities without number. These all originated, not with persons who reject the Gospel and the doctrine of responsibility, but with those who believed the Gospel, and paid some regard to its teachings.

If the Scripture doctrine that men are responsible to God, makes men persecutors, how is it that now, when that doctrine is more believed in England than it ever was before, there is less persecution? What else could check persecution but the Gospel of Christ? Infidelity has not checked persecution; she never dared to come forward to plead the cause of liberty, until Christianity had conquered the foe, and driven persecution from the field. When Christian martyrs had forced the government to relent, and obliged them either to abolish their persecuting statutes, or allow them to fall into oblivion, infidelity comes forward, joins its clamours with the shouts of victory, and claims the laurels won by Christianity. Infidel philosophers cannot afford to plead the cause of truth or equity, when there is any danger. They have but one short life to live, according to their system, and they must make the best of it. "Your modern Socrates will not drink hemlock," said the great infidel Voltaire. "If I had a hundred thousand men," says he, "I know what I would do; but as it is, I shall still work secretly." Like the

Socialists of the present day, Voltaire must have a mighty army at his disposal, before he dares declare his principles, or attempt to carry into effect his schemes; and until then he must act the hypocrite, and carry on his war against religion in disguise; and so he did. Christians come forth boldly, fearing no man. So strong was their love of truth and freedom, that they were willing to shed their blood in the cause; and in this way it is that Christianity, wherever it has prevailed, has so far destroyed the spirit of persecution.

Some professors of Christianity petitioned against Catholic Emancipation, we are told. I do not dispute it; but no enlightened and sincere Christians can plead for persecution. The question is not what Wesley, or Wesley's followers, or any one else did; but what men acting on the principles of the Gospel have done. Find me a man acting on the principles of Christianity as laid down by Christ, that persecutes and kills his brethren, and brings forward passages from Christ's own Gospel as his warrant for persecution and murder; that would be like proof. But there is no such man. And even if there were some madman, that pretended he had Christ's authority for persecuting and killing his fellow men, it would be no proof that the Gospel engendered a warlike and persecuting spirit.

But the Gospel has been in the world nearly two thousand years, it is said, and has not rid the world of persecution yet. Let it be granted, and what then? Christianity is not the cause of all the evil which it does not cure. All Christian sects are imperfect; but it is not the Gospel that causes their imperfections. Infidelity has been in the world more than two thousand years; but infidels are not yet free from crime; they have not learned to do without persecution and war. But thanks be to God, our cause can do without such cruel arts, and make its way in the world too. And it is gaining ground daily; and as it unfolds its principles, and extends its influence, the hideous phantoms of war and infidelity, with their cruel passions and savage deeds, pass away. We come forth from darkness and disorder into a world of light and harmony.

We breathe a purer air; we come nearer and nearer to the spirit of Christ; and in proportion as we advance in Christian knowledge, and acquire more perfectly the Christian character, we study more and more to promote "peace on earth, and good-will to men." This is our only system; and this system cannot fail, wherever it operates, to regenerate and bless mankind.

But even if we were to leave the Gospel itself out of sight, and try the question by the character of professing Christians, the result would be in our favour. There never were so many professing Christians in England as at this time, and there never was so little persecution. Professing Christians never read the Gospel so much as now, and yet they never were so much opposed to all violent and cruel proceedings. Confining our observations to professing Christians, we find no body of religious people now that lay it down as a principle, that they may lawfully persecute their fellow men for differences of opinion in religion. There is no such body. The Baptists, the Independents, the Old Methodists, the New Methodists, the Primitive Methodists, and the Quakers, all disclaim the right to persecute. Even the Church of England, though in consequence of its connexion with the State, it is almost out of our line,—yet the Church of England itself, I believe, will not lay down such a doctrine, that it ought to persecute. Even the Catholics of Ireland disclaim persecution. O'Connell, their representative in the House of Commons, declares that that man is no Christian, who would attempt to dictate to others in matters of faith. There are fifty or sixty different sects, or more, in this country; but not one of them understands the Gospel to teach or sanction persecution.

But there have been persons calling themselves Christians, that have understood the Gospel to sanction persecution, says Lloyd Jones. We know it, and we also know that there have been persons who have understood the Gospel to sanction other things also, which we now know to be quite contrary to the Gospel. We do not deny that men have misunderstood the meaning of pas-

sages of the New Testament, and have argued upon their wrong interpretation in such a way as to be led into the wildest mistakes; but the Gospel is not answerable for these mistakes. I attribute the abuses which are found in professing Christians to something wrong in themselves. In some cases I attribute them partly to the natural temperament of the men, as Lloyd Jones says: they were persons naturally prone to persecute; they lusted after power; they wanted wealth; they courted priestly domination; and they wrested the Sacred Scriptures from their plain and natural meaning, and put a false construction on them, to make them seem to sanction their wicked schemes.

I am sorry that the attention of the meeting should be confined to one single point so long: but it seems that Lloyd Jones has but this one argument, and that he is determined to go through with his catalogue of horrors, and leave the New Testament out of view. But he has proved nothing to his purpose; he has not proved that one of those persecutors was like Christ: he has not proved that any of them, in their spirit and conduct, were acting in accordance with the doctrines and precepts of the Saviour. I cannot be too emphatical in stating, that all the facts which have been quoted by my opponent, have nothing to do with the question. That individuals have persecuted, we know; and that persons calling themselves Christians have persecuted, we know; but did those people persecute under the influence of the doctrine and spirit of Christ? Other individuals were persecutors who were enemies to Christianity, but yet made use of the Christian name; and such impositions cannot be prevented. Infidels persecute, and yet cloak themselves under a Christian profession, and we cannot hinder them from doing so. I recollect at the Wrexham Teetotal Festival, a number of drunkards and publicans got teetotal medals and ribbons, and went reeling about the streets in a state of drunkenness, and calling themselves teetotallers, in order to destroy the cause of Teetotalism. We could not help that. So numbers of infidels have ranged themselves under the Christian standard,



and gone under the Christian name to shed blood ; other carnal and wicked men have done the same. The enemies of Christianity take advantage of this, and cry, "These are the effects of your Christianity." Wicked men will do these things ; but none except blind, evil-disposed persons can be deceived in this way. If a man wants to rob Africa of her sons, and make a market for slaves in the West Indies, can we hinder him from saying that he is a Christian, and that he understands the New Testament to sanction such practices ? Men will lie, do what we will ; "wicked men and seducers will wax worse and worse," in spite of the Gospel, "deceiving and being deceived." But what have those things to do with the Gospel ? The Gospel always inculcates meekness and charity ; these are its effects wherever it operates ; and any thing opposite to these is not of the Gospel, but of the world.

But Julian charged the Christians with being cruel to each other, Lloyd Jones says. How this should be I cannot tell, unless Julian had learned to distinguish between false pretenders to Christianity and true Christians. This is certain, Julian commended the Christians, and he wrote a letter to Arsacius, the Pagan high priest of Galatia, recommending him to imitate the Christians, and to urge upon the Pagans generally to imitate them also, especially in their love for one another, and in their charity for strangers. "See how the Galileans prosper," says he ; "we cannot prosper as they do, unless we imitate their virtues. While we neglect our own poor, they both support their own and exercise charity to strangers and enemies. The people observe this," added Julian, "and are led, in consequence, to join themselves to the Christians." Such was the character of Christians, as given by their enemy, Julian. But Julian was one of the best emperors that had ever lived up to his time, Lloyd Jones says. I do not dispute it : Julian was a Christian for a length of time, and he could hardly live under such a mild and benevolent system as Christianity, without being better than those who lived under the persecuting systems of antiquity. Christianity, too, had im-

proved the spirit of the age, and Julian felt the force of an improved public opinion that surrounded him. But others of the Pagans were against persecution, my opponent says : it is very likely ; but they learned their tolerating lessons from Christianity, the same quarter from which Julian learned his lessons of mildness. Whatever either the Pagans of old, or the infidels of modern times have learned, either of charity or toleration, they have learned from the Gospel. There was no other system from which they *could* learn them. There was not a tolerating government upon the earth before Christ came : and if it had not been for the influence of the Gospel, there is no reason to believe that there would have been a tolerating government on the earth at the present time. Though there were infidels in the world before this time, they never opposed persecution, or stood forth, at the risk of their lives, to plead for liberty. Christianity it is that has broken the rod of oppression, and given to men liberty in every age. And all that the *enemies* of Christianity have done has been, to avail themselves of the liberty which it has given them, to charge it with being a persecuting system. I am sorry that there should be so much blindness in men : I pity the men that have such a total perversion of mind ; I will not say wilful, for I know that men may be awfully blind, and yet be sincere. But I am sorry that men in this room, with the Gospel on the table, (I wish it were in their hearts,) should stand forward before a company of persons like this, who know that the accusation is utterly false, and charge the Gospel with inspiring a spirit of persecution. If Lloyd Jones will prove that there is no persecution any where but where the Gospel prevails, or that there is the most persecution where the Gospel prevails most,—if he will prove that the men who understand the Gospel best, who read it the oftenest, and who practise it the most, are the worst persecutors,—if he will prove that in proportion as Christianity spreads, persecuting laws are passed by governments, and that persecuting deeds are multiplied,—if he will prove that where Christianity is unknown or forgotten, persecuting laws do not exist,—if he

will prove these things, there will be some reason, some argument in his speeches. In his present course of proceeding there is nothing but utter declamation, bold, reckless, unsupported assertion. Let him bring forward some argument; let him show that there was a connexion between the bloody stories which he reads to us and the Gospel as taught and practised by Jesus Christ; that is, let him *try* to do it; he cannot *do* it, for there is no connexion between them. It would be as easy to prove that the sun is the cause of all the darkness in our coal-pits, and that the moon is the cause of the dimness and gloominess under the shadow of the forest trees, as to prove that Christianity is the cause of persecution, merely because it has not had time to remove the evil entirely from the earth.

When I consider the unwillingness of men to learn; the slow progress of all improvements; the strength of those principles of sensuality and carnality to which men are subject; the lust of power, of wealth, and of dominion, which reign over the souls of unconverted men,—when I consider these things, and look at the endless obstacles with which the Gospel has had to contend, I am amazed that it has wrought such wonders as it has: I am astonished at the happy effects it has produced: I rejoice that such a system ever came upon the earth, that its good tidings ever sounded in our ears and gladdened our hearts. And I am glad that it is still making its way among men, and extending its regenerating influence through the earth. So far from Christianity being driven into a corner, as Lloyd Jones would insinuate, either in England or America, it is filling the whole world. It is Persecution that is driven into a corner: it is become a story of past days. Lloyd Jones has to travel into what we call the dark ages for a history of persecution, when the Gospel was almost entirely unknown. But he will bring up his history to the present times, he says; he may easily do that, if he will only keep out of the way of Christ's true followers, and leave out of sight the New Testament, and confine himself to the history of individuals, or communities who were in a great degree igno-

rant of the Gospel, or strangers to its spirit. Nay, he may even carry his tale into futurity, and tell of cruel and unkind deeds till the last shades of darkness are swept away by the light of truth; but he will find nothing to justify his charges against the Gospel of Christ. The path of the Gospel is marked with blessings only, and blessings will follow its steps to the last.

And when the Gospel has finished its work, violence shall entirely cease. "Men shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." When the Gospel has finished its work, all remnants of evil shall have passed away, "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them." The savage shall become a saint; the murderer shall leave his deeds of blood, become kindly affectioned towards his fellow men, and be unwearied in his efforts to do good: and those men that used to waste their property in base indulgences; who abused their power to the injury of those around them; who spent their nights in devising malignant schemes, and their days in putting them in execution,—even those, when they fall under the transforming influence of the Gospel, shall throw their evil deeds away, shall bring their violent appetites and passions under wise control, shall learn to love as Christ loved, to labour as he laboured, and, like him, if needful, they will learn to suffer unto death to benefit and bless the world.

Mr. JONES:—

I believe, friends, I have only ten minutes to address you to-night; and I shall occupy that ten minutes in replying to what Mr. Barker has advanced during his last twenty minutes—I was going to say, speech, but I may more appropriately call it a sermon. He calls upon me to prove that Christianity has done this or the other, and that the Gospel has done this or the other. Now, it is Mr. Barker's business to prove that the Gospel has

done good, and nothing but good; it is my business to show you that it has done things which are not good. He tells you that what I have advanced is mere declamation, statement without proof, and that I cannot connect those things with the Scriptures. Mr. Barker, your Christian persecutors have saved me the trouble; they have connected them themselves; for I have given you the title of a work which is based upon Scripture-texts, and the author brings those texts to prove that the doctrine of persecution is scriptural. That work was translated from the Latin of Beza, by Bogerman, a man who was afterwards president of the Synod of Dort, and who recommended it to the magistrates to guide them in the persecution of men who differed from them. It does not wait for me to connect it; it connects itself. There was not a tolerating government in the world before Christ came, says Mr. Barker. I deny that, on the authority of Gibbon, who has stated, in his Roman Empire, that there were but two or three governments that denied toleration to their subjects. And I will tell Mr. Barker that, since Christ came, there never was a tolerating government. But Julian has said so and so: I told you what he had said of the Christians. Mr. Barker acknowledges that he had some excellencies, but he says he got them from the Christian religion. Here I stand: I give you the conduct of governments that were Christian. Were their acts bad? Yes. Oh, then says Mr. Barker, they got them from the heathens. I refer you to Julian, a Pagan emperor, whose conduct was good: yes, but, says Mr. Barker, it was the Christian religion that taught him that conduct. Thus I am hunted by Mr. Barker: if a Pagan's acts are good, Christianity is to have the credit; if a Christian persecutes, it is owing to Paganism. If this is not argument with a vengeance, I know not what is. Mr. Barker says, the supporters of the true church never persecuted. I will prove that they did; I will prove that John Wesley and the Methodists were persecutors. But "bide your time," Mr. Barker; I have not tracked it through all its effects yet; I shall come to them by and by. I will prove that all are persecutors; that Mr.

Barker's church, to which he belongs, are persecutors; so far as obstructing the doing of good to others can go; and that Mr. Barker himself has made use of persecuting language.

Now, friends, Mr. Barker has told you he wants me to connect one thing with another, to connect the Bible with persecution. I laid down a ground-work; the texts which I read were the ground-work of it; Mr. Barker has not refuted it; and the facts that I have read to you, will prove to your minds that they have erected a frightful edifice on that ground-work. Persecution stares you in the face: you cannot impute it to the Fathers; *its fumes and steam are at this day rolling around us*. Oh, but, this light of Christianity in the world has not had time to chase away all the darkness! What! not time! Not time! Is eighteen hundred years not time enough? How much more time does Mr. Barker want? Are we to have it in the year 2000, in 3000, or 4000? — If I can, as I shall do, track you from the first establishment of Christianity down to the present day; if I can show that your track is marked all the way with blood, blood, blood; if I can do that, and can show that the same spirit exists now, though curbed and kept in check by the enlightened portion of the public,—not the religious portion: if I can prove this with respect to the influence Christianity has hitherto exercised, I shall prove that it will be the same for one thousand years to come, except it is curbed and bridled. Oh, but Mr. Barker heard them pray for and pity me. I want neither his pity nor his prayers. I stand upon the ground-work of truth; I want to do you good, not to awaken your prejudices. It is only by striking the delusions out of your minds, which Mr. Barker's sermons inculcate; it is only by exposing the fallacy of those delusions, and showing you the evil of the false principles in which you have been tutored; it is only by thus coming before you, and braving your censure and prejudices; it is only by thus acting, that I can hope to do, what I trust will soon be done, if not by me, by others who will take the place I occupy. I know it will be done; I repeat it again and again. I repeat that.

while I respect the good disposition that originated a prayer on my behalf, I want not the thing itself. I want you to meet me boldly and honestly, as a man, to dispute on the facts laid down. I say the spirit of Christianity is the spirit of persecution. I have given you the texts which are connected with their proceedings, and you can connect them yourselves. I am showing you what the influence of Christianity has been, that it has not produced good, but an enormous amount of evil. I am doing what I promised to do; I promise you I will do it effectually. I will give you the history of their proceedings, such a history as I know you will not be well pleased with. You shall hear it now, and you will hear it again; for I know it will go through the length and breadth of the land; and I am glad that Mr. Barker has put his shoulder to the wheel to help its circulation.

Mr. BARKER:—

You have been told that it is my business to prove that Christianity has done good: I will do that, if spared, to-morrow evening. Reference has been made to Beza: it is said that he understood some passages of the New Testament to sanction persecution. That might be; but he was but one man, and a man that lived several hundreds of years ago, when Christianity was little understood generally, and but little understood by him. I question the fact myself, as given by Lloyd Jones, but if Beza did so understand one passage, it proves nothing against Christianity. But if the question were to be decided by theological writers, Beza's authority is nothing, as Lloyd Jones himself knows, compared with the authorities on the other side. For I could mention five hundred Christian authors who have understood the passage differently from Beza: five hundred Christian authors who have proved, not from one, but from five hundred passages of Scripture, that Christianity is opposed to persecution; and if Beza did hold the doctrine which is attributed to him, he was very much mistaken. And those are the writers by which we go, as far as we choose to follow any human authors; but we

follow no teacher in all things but Christ himself, and his words are more pure from every thing like persecution than the words of men are accustomed to be.

Gibbon's authority has been given, to show that there were but three persecuting governments in all the ancient world before the time of Christ. To show that Gibbon did not speak the truth, I will give you the following instances among others, in which ancient governments decreed and practised persecution. The Persians, who admitted no statues in their temples, persecuted the Egyptians and Grecians, and broke in pieces the statues of their gods. The different Egyptian cantons persecuted; and took up arms, fought most fiercely, sometimes against their vanquishers, sometimes against one another, to defend or avenge their gods, to persecute or to resist persecution. The laws of the Greeks and Romans were absolutely intolerant. The decree of Diopythes commanded that they who denied the existence of the gods should be impeached. Persecutions were commenced against Protagoras; Diagoras was banished by the Athenians, and a reward was offered for his head; Aristotle had to seek safety by flight; Anaxagoras with difficulty escaped death; all the philosophers were persecuted for having written or spoken against the gods of the country; a priestess was executed; Socrates was condemned to drink hemlock, because he was accused of not acknowledging the gods of the state. These facts show how intolerant were the persecuting laws of the most polished nation of Greece. The Roman laws were not less severe: they punished the worshippers of strange gods with death. Decrees and acts innumerable of an intolerant nature are to be found in their codes of laws; and frequent new measures for enforcing those laws are related in their histories. Mecænas, in his counsels to Augustus, recommended him to compel men to honour the gods according to ancient custom, and to hate and punish those who should attempt to make any innovations in religion. On those laws the different governments of Rome acted; persecution continued under the emperors; the Jews were banished or obliged to renounce their



religion ; Christians were exiled, spoiled, given up to all cruel torments, under Nero, Domitian, Maximinian, Diocletian, Trajan, and others ; the blood of Christians which was shed in ten persecutions was beyond all calculation. The philosophers themselves advocated persecution. Even Plato and Cicero both lay down intolerance as a fundamental law of states. The authority of Gibbon, indeed ! who was an insidious infidel, and who laboured to the utmost extent of his power to undermine Christianity. Such an authority is worth very little. In things concerning Christianity, he has been proved guilty of five hundred misrepresentations, and more. I will give you my authorities in opposition to Gibbon's, to prove the persecuting character of the Romans and the other ancient governments I have mentioned. These are Livy, Valerius Maximus, Dion Cassius, Tacitus (in his annals of the Roman empire), the histories of Greece and Rome generally, the codes of laws,—these works remain to the present day, and may be consulted by any individual.

I would observe, before I conclude, that I think it neither wise nor kind in Lloyd Jones, to have recourse to ridicule, and instead of producing arguments, cast out sneers at his opponent. It would be more seemly to lay such things aside ; still if they are continued, I feel disposed to bear them, but I cannot imitate him in such practices. My speeches are like sermons, he says ; but what has that to do with the question ? I have known sermons do much good, and they will still do good. I am thankful that our system needs no support but plain truth ; that it is a system of benevolence, and teaches us not to catch at words, or cavil about trifles, or fight for victory, but to instruct, and benefit, and seek the salvation of men.

We have now had a sample of what can be advanced against Christianity : the arguments you have heard to-night are just such as have been brought against Christianity from the first. Not one solid or well grounded objection against Christianity is to be found in all the works that have been written by its enemies from the days

in which it was first published to the present time. I have read the objections of Porphyry, of Celsus, of Julian, of Hobbes, of Toland, of Tindal, of Blount, of Woolston, of Hume, of Gibbon, of Burdon, of Paine, of Voltaire, of Rousseau, of Diderot, of Helvetius, of Carlile, of Taylor, of Owen, of Lloyd Jones, and of Haslam, and they are all alike. Arguments there are none; but false accusations, bold and extravagant statements, without truth or foundation, there are in abundance. Arguments there never can be against the truth. There was once a man that stood forth and contended that there was no matter in the universe; that every thing that we thought matter was nothing but fancy; and he advanced just such arguments as Lloyd Jones advances to prove that Christianity is a persecuting system. No sensible man believed the philosopher, though he was followed by a few persons in his time; and no one that thinks soberly will believe Lloyd Jones, or his arguments against Christianity. He may have his admirers for a time, but both he and they will pass away, and leave the Gospel conqueror and master of the field. The worst that infidels can do, has been done; they have tried their strength, and Christianity has still triumphed. They may try again; they may muster their forces, but they cannot prosper. Men may plant their batteries against the sun, but he will still go forward in his course, and his rays will shed light and warmth upon the earth as formerly: the enemies of Christianity may shoot their arrows, or play their artillery against the Gospel, but like the sun it will win its way, and give light and joy and salvation wherever it goes. Even now, while these men oppose it, it is imparting blessings to millions; it is giving liberty to exercise their reasoning powers even to those who are seeking its destruction. It is exerting a happy influence upon all lands; it is sending its light and blessings into every clime; it is shaking all nations, and changing and purifying the whole mass of human society. It is emancipating slaves, it is reforming drunkards, it is cheering with its bright prospects the hearts of believers, it is chasing away the shades of superstition, and imparting its light and its blessings to

thousands upon thousands, both in our own country and in distant lands. It is uniting together the most distant nations in the bands of mutual charity; and it is teaching those that are near together, to befriend and help each other; and it is giving light, and freedom, and plenty, and peace, and temperance, and joy,—all the comforts of time, and all the hopes and anticipations of eternity,—to tens and scores of millions. And it will still go on. Foolish and unhappy men may lift up their hands and think to push back the sun; but the sun will go calmly and quietly on, as though those men had no existence. So the enemies of the Gospel may think to check in his course the Sun of righteousness; but it will still shine on. And our Sun will never set: the world on which He has risen shall never see night again. Its decline may be foretold, but the prophecy will fail: it shall shine brighter and brighter, till the last clouds of error and guilt shall have passed away,—till there is not a sad heart in the universe, nor a bad man to be seen upon earth. It shall shine upon all lands and on all hearts, till all men shall not only be glad to receive the prayers of their brethren, but shall pray for themselves and for their brethren too. It shall shine till strife and persecution and war shall cease; and till affectionate and tender, and delightful sympathies shall mix all hearts in one. Then angels shall sing again, as once they sang, in prospect of this blessedness—"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace; good will towards men." Then the grand chorus shall be sung on earth by millions of happy voices, and be re-echoed from the heavens by millions of happy voices more—"Hallelujah; the Lord God omnipotent reigneth; the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." All nations shall be free and happy, and heaven shall come down to earth. For, thanks be to God, Christianity has not come merely to lift up us to heaven, but to bring down heaven to earth. And it has already made a heaven in thousands of hearts, and in thousands of families. There are souls in this place who know the truth of these things by their own experience,

who can scarcely help expressing their gratitude, that the Gospel was ever sounded in their ears. And, I thank God, there are millions scattered up and down the earth, and their numbers are increasing every year, who are gladdened with the same delightful feelings, and whose full hearts prompt them to shout aloud for joy. This is the fruit of Christianity. Thanks be to God, that ever he gave his Word to enlighten our minds, that ever he gave his Spirit to sanctify our hearts, and that ever he gave his Son, that through his death we might be pardoned; and blessed be his name, that by the establishment of Christian churches, he has made arrangements for spreading His light and purity and joy throughout the earth. I love the Gospel more and more; I never was so convinced of its tendency to bless mankind before; I never saw so clearly how little can be said against it. It is a system of benevolence from first to last; its effects are the joys of heaven itself; and its foundation is eternal truth. It stands on a rock; the floods cannot wash it away; the earthquake cannot shake it; nor can the winds and tempests throw it down. All the wrath of devils, all the rage of wicked men, the ravings of superstition, the deadly hatred of infidelity, the fraudulent and interested treachery of carnal men, avail nothing against it. It is unconquerable; it is invulnerable; it lifts its head above every danger, and lives and spreads for evermore. At this moment it is flying across every sea, and finding its way into every land. Like the river of the waters of life, it is rolling its life-giving streams through a thirsty world, and the panting inhabitants drink and live for ever. And as it hath blessed, so shall it continue to bless; as it hath rolled its healing waters through the earth, so shall it continue to roll them; and I and my fellow Christians will still stand on the banks of the living streams, and cry to our fellow men, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come; and whosoever will, let him come and drink, and be happy for ever."

Mr. HALLIWELL :—Ladies and Gentlemen, on behalf

of Mr. Barker's Committee, I have to return you most sincere thanks for the very great attention you have paid. I trust the coming night's discussion will display the same feeling, the same generosity, and that no excitement from the appeals that may be made to your feelings, will betray you into the expression of any disapprobation which may prevent the harmony of the meeting. To-morrow night, I beg to announce that we shall endeavour to accomodate the public more comfortably, by admitting a larger number of friends to the platform, and thus leaving more space in the body of the meeting. We shall also endeavour to place forty or fifty more in the female gallery, allowing the females to occupy the front seats, with which arrangement, I doubt not, every gentleman will be perfectly satisfied. The doors will be open to-morrow night at half-past six, and the discussion will commence at a quarter past seven; and I hope it will terminate, as peacefully and harmoniously as it has done this evening. Perhaps, my friend, Mr. Connard, the other Chairman, will address a few words to you.

Mr. CONNARD :—On behalf of Mr. Jones's Committee, I return you our sincere thanks for the patient hearing you have given to both disputants to-night; I trust, when you leave the room, the same peaceable disposition will be manifested towards one another, as long as you all live. I trust that to-morrow night, you will observe the same good conduct; and if you do so, I trust you will receive that benefit which will tend to your mutual good at another time.

Mr. HARRISON :—And on behalf of the gentlemen, on behalf

*Second Day, WEDNESDAY, February 20th.*

---

**MR. CONNARD :—**Previous to the gentlemen resuming the discussion, it is necessary that I should read over the terms and conditions of the questions to be discussed :—

“ First, Whether Christianity be the cause of all the crime and misery in our country. Secondly, Whether Christianity be not the cause of good wherever it operates, and good of every kind. Mr. Barker undertakes to prove that Christianity is not the cause of the misery and crime that abound in the country ;—that the tendency of Christianity is to produce only good ;—and that wherever it operates, it produces good, and good of every kind. Condition, That in the debate, nothing shall be taken for Christianity but the system of Christ as laid down in the New Testament.”

You must bear in mind, that when men differ in opinion, the only way to reconcile these opinions is by a full, fair, and candid discussion. Such I hope you will find this to be ; and as you manifested the most peaceable, orderly, and good behaviour last night, I hope you will do the same this evening. It has been remarked by several of our Manchester friends, that they never witnessed better behaviour, where so large a number of persons were assembled together, than they witnessed here last night. I hope the same good disposition will be manifested again this evening. It is not necessary for me to say more ; previous to calling on Mr. Barker, Mr. Halliwell, perhaps, may say something to you.

**Mr. HALLIWELL :—**Ladies and Gentlemen,—I am sure it would be unnecessary for me to repeat the observations I made last evening ; but as there are probably great numbers here now who did not hear the arrangements then entered into, it may be necessary to mention

some of them. It was understood last evening, that there should be no applause, however exciting the subject might be ; that there should be no disapprobation, however unpleasant the speeches might be ; and throughout the whole meeting, almost without exception, we were enabled to proceed without either applause or disapprobation. I trust it will be the same on this occasion : it is much more pleasant to the feelings of the respective committees, and prevents the manifestation of that spirit which, when manifested, produces sometimes the worst consequences. I beg also to remark, that the time allowed for the two first speeches will be half an hour each, and afterwards twenty minutes each. I may also remark, that as the discussion is confined to two nights, Mr. Barker has not, as he ought to have, the chance of the last speech ; Lloyd Jones, having begun the discussion, will also conclude it ; but it was perfectly understood that Lloyd Jones, in his last speech, should bring forward no new arguments, but simply reply to Mr. Barker's observations. I mention this that we may be, at the end of the meeting, as comfortable as we are at the commencement.

During the day, I have been frequently charged with not having discharged my duty last evening ; inasmuch as many friends supposed I had permitted Lloyd Jones to stray so far from the question, that they scarcely knew on what part of the question, or on what subject, he was speaking. For my own part, I rather chose to allow the utmost latitude, than to interfere with the harmony of the meeting. It is my intention to allow as great latitude on this occasion as I consistently can. I shall not interfere, unless interference be absolutely necessary. And the meeting must remember, that even if it should be necessary for myself or Mr. Connard to interfere, after one or both have been heard, our umpire will have to decide which is right and which is wrong. Then again, there has been a great deal of misapprehension to-day, in consequence of the manner in which the discussion was commenced last night : instead of the two first speeches occupying an hour, they occupied something short of ten minutes.

This arose in consequence of Lloyd Jones declaring off from one-half of the question at issue. Of course, if Lloyd Jones had a right to do that, Mr. Barker had an equal right to declare off from the other half: so that, if both had followed the same course, there would have been no discussion. But Mr. Barker did not follow that course; therefore, although the discussion did not, at the commencement, assume a regular form, it is hoped that, to-night, at least, having discarded one of the questions proposed for discussion, the remaining part will be freely, properly, and honourably discussed.

It was understood, when the acceptance of the question by Lloyd Jones occurred, that he had undertaken the opposite side of the question to Mr. Barker: that was perfectly understood, for the question was asked him; and how it is that the little word "all" should frighten Mr. Jones, I am perfectly at a loss to know. However, I think it unnecessary, on my part, to enter further into the matter; but to state to you, that had Mr. Jones taken up the whole question, either as a whole or only a part, Mr. Barker was fully prepared to have met him on every point. These explanations have become necessary, in consequence of the rumours which have been afloat during the day. I wish to cast no reflections, to make no severe remarks, to produce no ill feeling in the minds of Lloyd Jones's friends, or of the meeting; I have therefore endeavoured to clear up this matter in the best manner I am able. I hope, however, on this occasion to avoid interference; Lloyd Jones will not forget the condition of this discussion, contained in a written document respectively signed by the parties,—that in the debate, nothing shall be taken for Christianity but the system of Christ, as laid down in the New Testament. For my part, whatever persecutions, or whatever bloody occurrences may have taken place in history, unless Lloyd Jones is prepared to show that they have had their origin in the system of that book mentioned in the condition, namely, the New Testament, I shall consider them as having no bearing upon the question whatever. I make these remarks merely for the purpose of directing Lloyd Jones's attention to the condition.



Mr. JONES :—I shall mind my business.

Mr. HALLIWELL :—I will make no more remarks : only if the condition, as well as the question, is not adhered to, it may be necessary—I hope it will not—to interfere in the further part of the discussion. I should not have occupied your time so long, but it is two or three minutes short of the time for commencement. I shall now sit down by calling on Mr. Barker to commence.

Mr. BARKER :—

Mr. Chairman, my Friends,—I think it proper, before I enter upon the great question for discussion, this evening, to make some remarks in reference to what passed last evening. An attempt was made to prove that Christianity sanctioned persecution ; and four passages were quoted from the New Testament to establish this point. These passages, I contended, sanctioned no such spirit or practices as those of persecution ; and I wish to make an additional remark or two in reference to those passages. The first passage is in the thirteenth chapter of Acts, respecting Elymas the Sorcerer :—“ Sergius Paulus, a prudent man, called for Barrabas and Saul, and desired to hear the Word of God. But Elymas the Sorcerer withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith.” In continuation, the Apostle addressed him, charged him wickedness of conduct, and said—“ Now, behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness ; and he went about seeking some one to lead him by the hand.” It is added, “ Then the deputy, when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord.” It may be remarked, that sorcery was one of the greatest curses of the Gentile world : it had spread itself throughout society ; the inhabitants of the villages and cities were held slaves to those pretenders to sorcery and witchcraft. A greater mercy could scarce have been given to the Gentile world than to free them from the fetters under which they were enslaved, in consequence of the preten-

sions of those mischievous impostors. The course which Paul took to establish the truth of the Gospel, was to put an end to all such pretensions, and thereby demonstrate the truth and excellence of his religion; to deliver the population of the country from that bondage in which they had been held to the sorcerers, as well as afford a suitable admonition to Elymas himself, that he might have, for a season, a strong inducement to consideration, and if possible, be turned to the faith.

Another passage was the eighth verse of the first chapter of Galatians:—"I marvel that ye are so soon turned from him that called you unto the grace of Christ, unto another gospel; which in truth is not another: but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ." "But though we, or an angel from heaven," says Paul, "preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Here there is no persecution: all that is implied is—"Let him be disowned as a member of the church." This is no more than is done in every society: if a member of the Socialists adopts Christianity, and endeavours to form a sect in their community on principles directly opposite to Socialism, they disown him at once. If Robert Owen was giving directions how his communities were to be conducted, he would at once say—"Let the faithless and the apostates be disowned." If I were advising my friends at Oldham, I should speak in the same manner, and say—"If any man adopt infidel principles, and become a Socialist of the Owenite school, and attempt to form a society on principles opposite to the Gospel, let it be known to the public that he is not in connexion with you." This is needful in every society; further than this the Apostle does not go: and there is no trace of persecution here. The next passage is in the third chapter of Titus, and the tenth verse:—"A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." The Apostle adds—"knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." Here he alludes to persons who, having embraced entirely opposite opinions to those of the

church and Christianity, and begun to pursue quite contrary practices, endeavour to form a sect in opposition to the church of Christ. What can the church do in such a case, but disown such members? The motive and wish of the Apostle is to preserve the church and the name of Christianity from dishonour,—to disappoint bad men in their attempts to impose upon individuals, by having their principles made known; and the church would be highly to blame to allow a man to deceive its members under these false pretences, where by disowning him, they might make an end of his delusions. Lloyd Jones might have quoted another passage where those same heretics were referred to, which would have put the matter in a still clearer light:—"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them: for they that are such, seek not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." It is as plain as can be that the parties here referred to were the opposites of Christians; sensual men, seeking their own corrupt gratification and gain; "and, by good words," says he, "and fair speeches, endeavouring to deceive the hearts of the simple." The truth is, these heretics were a kind of Socialists, who adopted the Christian profession to gain support to a sensual and corrupt system, and draw away disciples after them. If there be no impropriety in the modern Socialists disowning men, by merely telling the public, "They are not members of our association," then there was no impropriety in the ancient church disowning the ancient Socialists. Impropriety, or persecution, there is not in the whole affair.

The last passage was, the sixteenth chapter of Mark and the sixteenth verse:—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, confirming the Word with signs following." Here it is as plain as possible that, so far from any one being required to believe without inquiry or evidence, no man was required to believe until

the whole Gospel had been unfolded, and its evidences laid before him: he might be permitted, for any thing said here to the contrary, to hear fifty preachers, and to make inquiries for ten years, or he might extend them to twenty: in fact, God only is to judge of a man's sincerity, or to say when his unbelief becomes criminal. Miracles were given, signs and wonders were wrought, all suitable evidence was employed, so as to leave individuals without excuse; but it is for God to judge when that time shall be that they have no further excuse for unbelief left; it is not for man to judge, much less to persecute or compel.

It was asked by Lloyd Jones, why did not Paul enlighten Elymas's understanding, instead of blinding his eyes? How could he have done more to enlighten him than he did do? Was he to use compulsion? Had he done that, he could not have left Elymas free, as God would have all men be; and compulsion would have been persecution. Would an opponent of persecution plead for that practice? I also showed, last evening, that the facts which were read to the audience by Lloyd Jones, had nothing whatever to do with the point in question. They are not the history of the effects of Christianity, any more than they are the history of the moon. They are the history of the effects of a system which is directly opposed to Christianity,—a system which Christianity came to destroy, which it is destroying, and in fact, will destroy utterly as it proceeds. Call those cruel facts the history of Christianity! As a friend of mine observed after the meeting last night, he might just as well have read over to us the Newgate Calendar, or the lives of a number of noted highwaymen, and called it the history of Great Britain. With equal propriety, he might give us the history of a wrestling-match, or a dog-fight, at the last Oldham election, and call it the history of the effects of the Reform Bill. There is just as much connexion between those excesses and the Reform Bill, as there is between the stories he has read over and the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This point is therefore settled; not a single passage of Scripture which he has quoted sanctions persecution in the least. All present, I

think, who have attended to the question, will see that if these are the strongest props of the system which my opponent advocates, that system must soon come down. When arguments like these are the very best which can be found to prove Christianity a persecuting system, by ten thousand inquisitive infidels, running through the New Testament in search of arguments, it is plain enough how hardly they are put to it : while on the other hand, a thousand passages and more can be found, by any simple man, which directly discountenance persecution, and enjoin those tempers and practices that are most opposed to a persecuting spirit. Besides this, the examples of the Apostles are against persecution ; the example of Christ is against persecution ; the history of Christianity, and of the facts that present themselves to our view in the world around us, prove that the Gospel is against it. Where the Gospel is most read and best understood, there is the least persecution ; where it is the least read and least understood, there is the most persecution. Those sects that pay the most regard to the New Testament persecute the least ; those that pay the least regard to it are the most prone to persecute. Those countries where the Gospel is not known are the most savage and ferocious and persecuting ; those where it is best known, are the most gentle and forbearing. Every fact that we can look upon, is in direct opposition to the charge that Christianity is a persecuting system : a wilder and more unfounded calumny could never have been invented or uttered by man.

Before I come to the main question, I will just make one remark respecting Constantine. Constantine was the first Roman emperor that embraced Christianity, and he was the first emperor ever heard of in the history of the universe, who made laws against persecution. But it is said that he grew worse as he went forward ; now I just happened to open upon a passage which will show that he did not grow worse. He was not only the first that passed a law against persecution ; he also was the first heathen emperor that passed a law to restrain the power of the father over his children, to prevent the destruction

of up-grown children by their fathers ; and humanely ordered that those children should be maintained by the public whose parents were not able to do it ; and in the year 319, he put an effectual stop to the destroying of children, by making it a capital offence. He passed another act of great humanity : it was very customary to expose children, to carry out new-born babes into the streets or fields, and leave them to take their fate. This had been encouraged by a great many law-givers. Exposure, or the murder of infants, had been enforced by Lycurgus, and by the laws of Rome ; but Constantine passed a law to restrain that practice wherever it prevailed. He also abolished the savage custom of crucifixion.

We now come to the great question, Whether Christianity does not produce good wherever it operates, and good of every kind ? I shrink from no part of my engagement in this matter ; I shall not lay aside the part which says, " good of every kind," to make my task easier. I agreed to the terms as they were read over, and I should think it improper to flinch one hair's-breadth. I feel thankful that I have no need to do so : the cause I advocate is capable of demonstration throughout. The question, whether Christianity produces good wherever it operates, may be decided by a reference to the principles and precepts of Christianity. The precepts of the Gospel are directed against all crimes, which are the cause of human misery. A great deal of misery originates in evil passions, anger, envy, malice, and revenge ; these are the perpetual tormentors of the soul where they dwell. But these are all forbidden and discountenanced by the New Testament.

A great deal of the disorder and confusion in society originates in injustice and deceit, in oppression and slander, in strife, and calumny, and revenge. In the New Testament these practices are all denounced. The Apostle forbids the master to oppress his servant ; he commands him to render to his servant that which is just and equal. He forbids us to lie,—“ laying aside lying, speak every man the truth with his neighbour.” The Gospel forbids strife and emulations ; commands us

to speak evil of no man, but to render unto all their dues, and to do unto others as we would they should do unto us.

A great deal of the misery of mankind originates in intemperance, in drunkenness especially, and a great deal may be traced to other branches of licentiousness and prodigality. Many poor creatures have been undone, and many thousand families have been distressed and afflicted, by seduction, by some heartless man taking away the daughter of his neighbour, and leading her to sin and ruin. Much misery is occasioned by the prevalence of fornication and uncleanness. These also are forbidden by the Gospel: we are commanded not to name them, that is, not to speak of them as common or allowable matters, A great deal of crime and misery in many countries originates in bad regulations with respect to marriage, such as one man being permitted to have many wives, or a man being permitted to turn away his wife at pleasure. This is forbidden by Christ. God, says he, ordained that one man and one woman should go together. It was so ordained at the first, and he forbids any man to put away his wife except for the cause of adultery. Let these principles be acted on, and what will be the consequence to our country? Five-sixths of all our crimes have been attributed to drunkenness by some writers. A very great many violent deaths are caused by it every year; and family troubles without end, are attributable to the same prolific source of evil. It is daily wasting men's property, injuring their health, shortening their lives, ruining their characters, distressing their families, and disturbing their neighbourhoods. It is taking away not less than a hundred millions of our money annually. To what an awful amount must this single vice injure our country and mankind! Let it be entirely abolished, according to the directions of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and we shall be wealthy, and peaceful; thousands upon thousands of families will be made happy; death will come more seldom, and in a milder form; men will not so suddenly break asunder the cords of friendship and brotherhood; while health,

intelligence, plenty, freedom, all the comforts of time, and all the blessings of eternity, will follow in the train of the temperance reformation. Let but the principles of Christianity be acted on, and every slave will be at once made free; there will not be a dishonest man, nor an unjust master, nor an injured slave, upon the face of God's creation. Let these principles be acted upon, and mankind are free, they are united together as brothers; and instead of injuring, they befriend, and help, and comfort one another.

But the New Testament does not stop at merely forbidding vices. It enjoins men to act with unbounded, sincere, ardent, impartial, universal, and unwearied charity. I will just give you a short epitome of the Gospel precepts, and a brief character of the Gospel morality; it is from the first Epistle of Peter. "And beside this," says the Apostle, "giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity." Only fancy a man who possesses these virtues, and acts on these principles; a man who believes the Gospel, and who adds to his faith, courage, which enables him to profess it boldly before all the world. He adds to his courage, knowledge, that he may understand in what way to proceed so as to benefit, to the best advantage, his fellow men. He adds to his knowledge, temperance. Temperance keeps him in health, prevents his resources from being wasted, makes him strong and active in mind and body, and enables him to use all the wealth and influence God has given him unimpaired and unwasted, to promote the welfare and happiness of his fellow men. He adds to his temperance, patience; so that while spending his health, his time; and his wealth in doing good, though he meet with opposition and disappointment, he still perseveres, unaltered and undiscouraged. To patience he adds godliness; he prays to his Father which is in heaven, and asks the assistance of that blessed Spirit which can succeed all the efforts of God's people. To godliness he adds brotherly kindness,



which unites him closely with all Christians, so that they form one band, to counsel each other, unite their energies together, and go forth like a well disciplined army of benefactors, to scatter blessings through all the earth. He adds to brotherly kindness, charity,—an affection which embraces all the world, and will not rest until every tear is dried, every want relieved, and every man's body and soul blessed together, and all men made heirs of an everlasting inheritance in heaven. This is an epitome of the Gospel morality. I might have read larger quotations to the same purpose, but to read all such passages would take up all our time, for the New Testament is full of such exhortations. Those are the precepts which are scattered up and down on every page of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The tendency of this Gospel must be to do good,—to do away with crime and misery, wherever it operates,—to inspire all good affections, and lead to all happy practices,—to make man happy himself, and the means of communicating happiness to others.

Having established this point, that Christianity does good *wherever it operates*, I shall proceed to show that it has actually operated, and that wherever it has operated it has done good. Thus it is recorded in the New Testament, that when the Gospel was preached, it was believed by great multitudes; and what were the effects produced? Every man began to love his fellow men as himself, and to seek the happiness of all around. They did not, it is true, give up their houses, and go into a community; but they parted with such of their possessions as could not otherwise be made available for the purposes of charity, and turned them into money. They regarded their property, not as their own, but as common property, to be used for the good of the church and the good of the whole world. As soon as they formed themselves into churches, deacons were appointed to look over the widows, the poor, and the orphans, and to see that their wants were provided for;—the very first time that such an institution ever existed upon earth. Thus was the organization of the church directed to the relief

of the distressed, as well as to the propagation of the truth: there were deacons to look after the temporal necessities of the members of the church, and preachers to go forth and promote the spiritual interests of the world.

We have other testimonies, besides those given in the New Testament itself, to the excellence of the effects produced by Christianity. We quoted Julian last night; he tells the high priests of idolatry, that it is a disgrace to the Pagans to disregard those of their own religion, while Christians are doing kind offices even to strangers and to their enemies. Again, he proceeds to say—"The Galileans (the name he gives to Christians) notice our supineness, and they take advantage of it: while we neglect the poor, they are ever kind to them; hence, while they obtain influence every where, we lose it; and our cause must sink, and theirs must rise, unless we imitate their beneficence." Lucian also, another opponent of the Gospel, pointed to the Christians as patterns of love and charity; their love for one another became a proverb, and men used to say, "See how these Christians love one another."

The influence of Christianity upon those who embraced it has been related, and painted in the most affecting and glowing colours, even by the enemies as well as the friends of the Saviour of mankind. I will enter upon some particulars.

In the first place, by the influence of Christianity, wherever it prevailed, the great superstructure of Idolatry was shaken and thrown down; the Pagan temples were deserted; purchasers of sacrifices for idols were no longer to be found; and hence all the cruelty, pollution, and crime connected with every system of idolatry, ceased at the same time. The people had been accustomed to offer human sacrifices, and to prostitute themselves to the vilest lusts, in the worship of their idols. They had been in the habit of sacrificing themselves to their idols, of wounding, mutilating, and destroying themselves. But when Christianity prevailed, these things passed away. Instead of bowing down to wooden gods, they worshipped the Maker of all things: instead of

performing foolish and unclean rites, and offering cruel sacrifices, they worshipped the Father in spirit and in truth. Rational worship was inculcated: the sacrifices Christians offered were to do good and to communicate their blessings to others; for with these sacrifices, the Gospel taught them, God is well pleased. Instead of offering their children as a sacrifice to idols, they consecrated them to God, and trained them up in his service. Instead of practising all uncleanness, the greatest purity was required and maintained in the worshippers of the true God. The system was totally changed, and the benefits resulting to those upon whom Christianity exerted its influence, were innumerable and incalculable.

Christianity also struck at the root of all kinds of superstition. Superstition oppressed and afflicted the whole world. Astrology, soothsaying, fortune-telling, sorcery, witchcraft, omens, magic, the observance of lucky and unlucky days, of lucky and unlucky places and events, every where prevailed. The sorcerers tyrannised over every village; they entered into the councils of the nations, and directed the movements of armies. The whole world was in slavery, abject slavery, to those pretenders to supernatural powers. But when Christianity came, it swept away those pretences, as the sun dispels the clouds of the morning: it revealed a God that governs all things, ordering all the affairs of the universe, and the pretensions to supernatural powers on the part of man were at once exploded. Christianity taught them that there was a powerful Being, by whom the very hairs of their head were numbered; a God that could keep them from the power both of sorcerers and devils; that nothing could harm them while they were followers of God, and that all the sufferings of this present life should be made to work for their good. They were thus made free, independent, and happy.

Mr. JONES :—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—Permit me to say that I am extremely well pleased with the moderation exhibited by the meeting last night; and it is evident to

me that some good will arise from this discussion. Whether the truth be on my side of the question, or whether it rests on the side of the question espoused by Mr. Barker, while you listen quietly to our arguments on both sides, you will, I have no doubt, listen profitably. Mr. Halliwell, at the opening of to-night's proceedings, made some few remarks that I consider to be uncalled for. When I gave you, last night, a history of the proceedings of the early Christians, I gave you the texts of Scripture, from the New Testament, which they themselves quoted in support of such proceedings. And if the New Testament, or those texts of Scripture, as they were interpreted by the parties that used them for such purposes, had not the influence in doing what I stated they had done, and if I did not trace out that connection, then I did nothing. But will Mr. Barker stand up here, will any member of any dissenting church in England, get up and declare that he is an infallible guide,—that he alone can give a just interpretation of what Scripture means? No church lays claim to that power but the Catholic church. Mr. Barker discards *infallibility*; he does not hold himself to be an infallible judge. Therefore, he has no right to give me *his interpretation*, and say it is a just interpretation. I have as good a right to say, that the interpretation put upon those texts of Scripture by Beza, when he quoted them in favour of persecution, was a just interpretation; and it was a just one to him.

—The course, then, that I took last night, is the course I will take to night; and I do maintain, that that course having been sanctioned last night, cannot, with fairness or propriety, be disturbed or interrupted to-night. I am sorry that Mr. Barker's friends are alarmed at the thing; I tell him and them that the truth must prevail; whether they or my friends are alarmed, is a matter of little consequence. Let the discussion go on, let the truth prevail, for it will be triumphant. My opponent's chairman seemed to cast imputations upon me for running away from the first part of the question; and he said that Mr. Barker had as good a right to run away from

the second part of the question. Allow me to state, that the first part of the question, or the proposition contained in it, was never assented to by me, or any one of my party: it was an imagination of Mr. Barker's, cast as a slander upon us. I never made any such assertion; therefore I am not abandoning any assertion I ever made. The second proposition was laid down by Mr. Barker as a true proposition; therefore he had no right to abandon it. There would be a wide difference between Mr. Barker's abandonment of the second proposition and my abandonment of the first.

I now come to a few of the closing remarks made last night by friend Barker. He seemed to cast a doubt upon the authority of Gibbon, and stated that he had been convicted of five hundred errors. Allow me to tell Mr. Barker, that with all the errors of Gibbon, and notwithstanding all his errors, he has acted more fairly by the Christian public than they have acted by him. So much are they afraid of him, with all his errors, that in the new edition of his works, they have endeavoured to destroy his arguments against the Christian religion. Do you call that fairness or honesty? If Gibbon was dishonest, you are frightfully dishonest. Allow me to tell you, the edition of Gibbon to which I allude is Milman's, lately published. After enumerating a number of good precepts in the New Testament, Mr. Barker went on to speak of their effects; and there was a spirit of benevolence running through all he said. Very well; as soon as we come down to Mr. Barker, we shall see to that. He then enumerated a great number of infidel writers whom he had read. I am only sorry that Mr. Barker was not a little more correct in his enumeration; for, at the head of his list, he places Porphyry and Celsus. Mr. Barker must be an extremely clever man, to have read the works of Porphyry, which were out of existence in the reign of Constantine: not a leaf nor a letter of them was then in existence; and the only knowledge we have of his works is by their being mentioned in the edict of Constantine against Arius. To prove the truth of this, I will read a passage from the edict of Constantine. He

says—"For as Porphyrius, the sworn adversary and deadly foe of divine service, who lately published lewd commentaries, in the confutation and defiance of the Christian religion, was rewarded according unto his desert, and so recompensed that within the compass of these few years he was not only grieved with great reproach, and blemished with the shameful spot of infamy, but also his impious and blasphemous works, *perished and utterly were abolished.*" And yet it seems Mr. Barker has found them somewhere, and has read them. Allow me, also, to tell Mr. Barker that the works of Celsus have no existence; the only portion of them which we have are those passages which have been extracted by Origen into his writings, for the purpose of confutation; the works themselves were destroyed by the edict of the Emperor Theodosius the Second.

Now to the subject matter of to-night's discussion, and to a few of the remarks made by Mr. Barker. He has endeavoured to put a different interpretation upon the passages of Scripture that I read to you last night for your consideration; and he maintains that the instances I brought forward were not persecutions; that striking a man blind was not persecuting him, but a mode of convincing him, and of convincing Sergius Paulus through him. Now, I don't know what idea Mr. Barker may have of persecution: but if I were struck blind by any person, I should think that it was persecuting me. But Mr. Barker seems to have a strange dictionary; I shall comment on that, by and by. The next portion of Mr. Barker's dictionary is in reference to this passage:—"If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be *accursed.*" Oh, but says Mr. Barker, that does not mean any thing bad; it only means that you are to reject him from your congregation, not to have him among you. But in another place we are told, "A man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition; *reject.*" Therefore, according to Mr. Barker's definition, cursing and rejecting are exactly the same thing. But, as I said before, it is not with Mr. Barker's definition that I have to do. There was a body of men

in existence, who held more power over the destinies of the world than Mr. Barker holds, or ever will hold,—I allude to the Popes of Rome,—who attached a very different meaning to the word “accursed;” for with them it meant not only rejection from the congregation, but at the same time, a denial to the person rejected of all the sympathy and aid which one brother can render to another; putting a whole nation into mourning, sackcloth, and ashes; and empowering the priests to rush in and dis sever the ties by which nature has bound every heart in existence. Oh, but these heretics were very bad men, they were bad and sensual men, in fact, they were Socialists, according to Mr. Barker. Now, many of you heard Mr. Barker, last night, preach about the charity that St. Paul spoke of; indeed, it is such a beautiful thing, he told us, it could not think any evil. Oh, no, but Mr. Barker thinks that the Socialists are sensualists; now he is full of charity, and does not think any evil. Then he tries to justify the passage in Mark, the 16th chapter and 16th verse—“He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” When Christ made use of these words, according to Mr. Barker, he also supplied the nations with a *sufficiency of evidence*. The answer is very easy; if they had been supplied with a *sufficiency of evidence*, belief would have followed, and there would have been no occasion for hell.

The point, then, according to Mr. Barker, is quite settled, there being no connexion at all between these passages and the persecutions that flowed from them. But if the persecutions were grounded upon them, if the parties persecuting say themselves that they were grounded upon them, and give the passages as their authority for persecuting, then there was a connexion,—a connexion which Mr. Barker can never destroy. Therefore, I say to Mr. Barker, the point is settled; but not settled according to the manner in which he would wish to see it settled. After giving these passages the nicest explanation and interpretation which he could, Mr. Barker says they are all that ten thousand inquiring infidels could find out. I will tell Mr. Barker that they did not wait

to be found out by inquiring infidels; Christians found them out, and Christians interpreted them, and Christians founded persecution upon them; it was not infidels who discovered these passages, but Christians; Christians wrote in favour of such passages, they found them out, and they found out that they sanctioned persecution. But, he says, these were not the effects of Christianity. I tell Mr. Barker these were the effects of those texts which are a portion of Christianity, which exist in the New Testament; and it is the effects of this that I am speaking about. They are not, then, unfounded calumnies; Mr. Barker cannot reason them away. It is a very easy matter to draw a *pretty picture*; it is very easy for Mr. Barker, as he did last night, to imagine what he knows in his heart has no existence. But it is not so easy to reason away the *facts* I laid before the meeting; there they stand recorded as your actions; the printing press has made them eternal; they will stand to the end of time as witnesses against you. I last night stated, that Constantine became worse the longer he remained in the Christian school. This remark I made in consequence of an expression which Mr. Barker had made use of: he said that Constantine first passed a law against persecution, but that his Pagan principles broke in upon him, and then he passed laws in favour of persecution. I merely said, that while Constantine's first acts, after he turned a Christian, were acts of toleration, the acts that subsequently followed were acts of persecution, and, therefore, he got worse in the Christian school; and if those things are true, he did get worse in it. But the laws Mr. Barker spoke of have nothing to do with the matter. Can he trace them to the effects of Christianity, because other emperors, who were not Christians, have passed laws against Christianity? Surely, if I am from the question, Mr. Barker is a thousand miles from it.

Then, a number of beautiful precepts were enumerated by Mr. Barker; and he says they form one bond of brotherhood all over the world, and they are doing good here and doing good there. Now, if we could, for a



moment, abstract ourselves from the every-day occurrences of life, we might imagine, from this description, that we were dwelling in a most delightful Utopia, in a Paradise, where all the flowers and birds that existed in nature were congregated together to administer to our happiness. I was almost led away by this vision, until, bethinking me of the ties which bind me to earth, and of the realities which exist around me, I said to myself, Where is the picture supplied by Mr. Barker? and echo answered, "Where!" Does it exist in reality? No: it exists in the mind of Mr. Barker alone, and only *there* at the moment that he is speaking of the excellence of Christianity; for I will prove to you that he thinks differently at *other* times. That I will prove to you. But Mr. Barker says, the Christians were extremely good at first; they were a perfect brotherhood, they even sold their property, and brought it all together. Yes, but even in bringing that property together they were not a perfect brotherhood; because, when one man and his wife, Ananias and Sapphira, thought they had better keep a little back, some of the Apostles were so good as to strike them dead; so you see what a good feeling must have existed among them. But as Mr. Barker's statements are merely views, and as I like to deal in realities, I will give you the language of Paul himself to the early Christians. Speaking to the Corinthians, he says, "For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" Were it not that the Apostle told me so, I should have been inclined to believe Mr. Barker; but I cannot take his authority in opposition to that of the Apostle Paul.

Now, my friends, I will proceed with my little history of persecution, and I will run over it as briefly as I can. I will take it up where I finished before, beginning with the Council of Chalcedon. This council was called to decide on the heresy of Dioscorus and Eutyches, who had asserted that "Jesus Christ consisted of two natures before his union or incarnation, but that, after this, he had one nature only." He also denied that the body of

Christ was of the same substance with ours. Well, the bishops and others met, and sat, and you may suppose what a very kindly feeling prevailed among them, for as soon as they begun, some of the fathers cried out,—“Damn Dioscorus, banish Dioscorus, Christ hath deposed Dioscorus!”

MR. HALLIWELL:—I must certainly interfere. My friends behind think that Lloyd Jones is pursuing a course which is contrary to propriety. The meeting will observe that no one has a right to interfere but ourselves and the Umpire. If I am proved to be in the wrong, I shall sit down quite willingly; of course, if I am right, Lloyd Jones must change his plan. The condition of this discussion, “that in the debate nothing shall be taken for Christianity but the system of Christ as laid down in the New Testament,” must be adhered to. Can Lloyd Jones prove that this is the system of Christ as laid down in the New Testament? If he can, then he must proceed.

MR. JONES:—Very well, my friend, I’ll tell you.

MR. CONNARD:—Ladies and Gentlemen,—I believe it is my duty to speak now. I fully agree with Mr. Halliwell, that it is our business to interfere, and no other person’s. A gentleman at the back of Mr. Barker whispered to the Umpire, and he called on Mr. Halliwell to interfere. I say this is not honourable treatment.

MR. JONES:—Allow me, before there is any more contention about this matter, to say a word in my own justification. The question is, Whether Christianity is not the cause of good wherever it operates, and of good of every kind. Now, we are only to look into the Testament for the thing itself: and we are to look at the acts of those who call themselves Christians for the influence of the thing. Therefore, I look at the Testament for the thing itself, and I look at the church for its influence; and I do maintain that, in doing this, I am keeping strictly to the question. If it is not so, I ask Mr. Halliwell with what feeling of consistency he can interfere to prevent the course to-night which he allowed me to adopt last night. I say it is an unfair proceeding; and

if allowed to be carried on, I shall appeal to the public against such injustice.

Mr. HALLIWELL:—Ladies and Gentlemen,—Lloyd Jones shall not have injustice : he shall have justice, but not in his own way. According to the rules of discussion——

[There was considerable uproar in the meeting at this time.]

Mr. JONES :—Can you object to my argument consistently ?

Mr. HALLIWELL :—I must remark, that the suggestion that Mr. Jones was pursuing a wrong course, was not made to me by the Umpire, but by a gentleman who sits here, giving me any assistance that I may require. Now, he had a perfect right to do that, and it is very unbecoming in Lloyd Jones's friends to interfere ; because, after Mr. Connard and myself have given our opinions, the matter will be submitted to the Umpire, who will state his reasons for the decision he may come to. Both Mr. Jones's Chairman and myself are in the hands of Mr. Halliday ; to his decision we must bow.

Mr. JONES :—I wish to ask who is the gentleman that whispered Mr. Halliwell. I say that no gentleman has a right to whisper to him. Who is he, sir ?

Mr. HALLIWELL :—Ladies and Gentlemen,—Lloyd Jones, last night, received assistance from half-a-dozen friends ; so did his Chairman ; and we will to-night receive assistance from whomsoever we think proper, without consulting any one. Lloyd Jones ought to sit down, and leave the question to the Chairmen and the Umpire.

Mr. JONES :—Then, if the Umpire gives his decision against me, I will have a meeting in this town to-morrow night. I will go through my history, and it shall be published.

Mr. HALLIWELL (after consulting with his friends, during which great confusion prevailed in the meeting,) —I fancy this meeting must be aware that we can understand from whom this disturbance comes. I shall exercise my best abilities to prevent disturbance on the part of my friends ; and I claim the exercise of the same

influence from my opponents. When I interfered, I had a right to interfere, occupying the situation which I do. If I have unhandsomely, or ungentlemanly interfered, Lloyd Jones can state it; but I must say, it is unbecoming to attempt intimidation in the manner in which Lloyd Jones has done, by threatening what he will do hereafter. That is a matter for his own judgment, and can gratify his own feelings and those of his friends only. He has a perfect right to meet here to-morrow night, or for three hundred and fifty nights to come, without our interference, or any of our friends. But Lloyd Jones shall not have the privilege of meeting here and taunting us with injustice. I and my friends have resolved that Lloyd Jones shall pursue his own course, shall say what he likes, and argue as he pleases. I will therefore sit down, and permit him to go on.

MR. JONES :—Now I am allowed to go on ; but I had rather submit to the Umpire, if he decided against me. I would submit it to him and the Chairmen on those grounds ; and I have no fear for my principles.

MR. HALLIWELL :—If Mr. Jones wishes to do so, we are willing. The Umpire was mutually chosen ; he was the gentleman fixed on by both sides.

MR. JONES :—I have no objection to take it either way. I shall commence where I was interrupted by Mr. Barker's Chairman ; and I hope I shall have the time allowed.

MR. HALLIWELL :—Very well : I think we have interrupted you ten minutes.

MR. JONES :—I told you what were the results of the Council of Chalcedon. The next we come to is the Council of Constantinople. They met because of the opposition that had been made to the four former general councils, and to take into consideration the writings of Origen, which Eustachius, bishop of Jerusalem, accused, as full of many dangerous errors. The first question debated in that council was this :—" Whether those who were dead were to be anathematised, or accursed ?" So strong was their religious feeling, that they were not content with excommunicating and cutting off the living,

but they wanted to dig into the very graves, and curse the bones of those who were rotting in them. And we are told that "one Eutychius looked with contempt on the fathers for their hesitation in so plain a matter, and told them that there needed no deliberation about it; for that king Josias formerly did not only destroy the idolatrous priests who were living, but dug also those who had been dead long before out of their graves. So clear a determination of the point who could resist? The fathers immediately were convinced, and Justinian caused him to be consecrated bishop of Constantinople in the room of Meros, just deceased, for this his skill in Scripture and casuistry."

The next was the third Council of Constantinople, to decide whether Christ had two wills. Persecution followed that. The next was the Nicene council of 787, to decide whether images should be set up in churches. After deciding in the affirmative, they added, according to custom,—“Damnation to all heretics; damnation on the council that warred against venerable images; the Holy Trinity hath deposed them.”

Thus, you see, friends, I have followed the early Christians from the first century to the eighth, and have tracked them through blood and desolation, from the moment they got the least power into their hands. It was then found necessary, not to be calling councils occasionally, to take into consideration new heresies, but to establish the Inquisition, which should cut off every heresy in the bud; and such was the extensive use made of this frightful institution, that it desolated that part of the world where it existed.

Perhaps I am not offering any arguments against Mr. Barker's system; but I am taking the thing down from the first to the last; and, as I told you before, I shall be at home directly. One would have imagined that the men who differed from the orthodox on those points, when they got the power into their hands, would have been, at least, tolerant; and that Luther, Calvin, and those parties would have been good and tolerant men. But what was the consequence, what was the real result of the Refor-

mation? That Luther himself sanctioned persecution, and allowed that heretics might be corrected. But Calvin improved upon Luther, and absolutely wrote in defence of persecution. He was the means of causing Servetus, whom he called a heretic, to be burned; and he wrote a work, which was published in Geneva, to prove that it was lawful to burn heretics:—"A Declaration for maintaining the true Faith, held by all Christians concerning the trinity of persons in one only God, by John Calvin, against the detestable errors of Michael Servetus, a Spaniard; in which it is also proved, that it is lawful to punish Heretics, and that this wretch was justly executed in the city of Geneva. Geneva, 1554."—That was the title of the work. These were the Reformers, men who had thrown off the shackles of Popery. His treatment of Castellio is said to have been rude and cruel; and in some of his writings he calls him—"blasphemer, reviler, malicious barking dog, full of ignorance, bestiality, and impudence, an impostor, a base corrupter of the Sacred Writings, a mocker of God, a contemner of all religion, an impudent fellow, a filthy dog, a knave, an impious, lewd, crooked-minded vagabond, beggarly rogue!"

This is that nice bond of brotherhood which Mr. Barker so beautifully portrayed to you: what a pity it is, that it never had an existence! One would have imagined that the enlightened followers of Calvin would have exhibited it. Did they do so? You have all seen, I doubt not, Combe's Constitution of Man, and have noticed a representation of the head of Melancthon. This head has been called by phrenologists the *chef d'œuvre* of the Almighty; it possesses large benevolence, and every good organ. Well, he actually wrote in his letters, that he wondered how any body could condemn the proceedings of Calvin, about the burning of Servetus. So you see that one of the noblest works of the Almighty, in consequence of these bad principles, was led to act in this malignant manner. Bucer, another Reformer, said publicly in his sermon, that Servetus ought to have his bowels pulled out, and to be torn in pieces. There was a nice sentiment to come out of the mouth of a Christian

preacher in the pulpit! In fact, if I were to read you all the passages of this kind, you would be sickened at the proceedings of these extremely kind, charitable, and good Christians. It may be said these were but individuals, and that I have no right to charge Christian bodies and churches with the proceedings of individuals, though they might be leaders. Allow me to tell you, that these practices were not confined to individuals, such as Calvin, Luther, and Melancthon, but were adopted by the whole body, their churches and their councils. The council of Geneva, in particular, in 1632, put Nicholas Anthoine to death for heresy. This council was composed of senators, ministers, and presbyters; so that, it may be supposed, all their piety and Christian love was congregated together. V. Gentilis was forced, by Calvin and others, to walk naked through the streets, publicly to denounce his own works, and burn them with his own hands; he was then taken prisoner, and was afterwards beheaded for writing these works. At Basil also, heresy was punishable with death since the Reformation; one David George, who was banished, had his body burned after death, in consequence of his heresies. At Zurich, Felix was drowned, for being a Baptist. John Sylvanus was put to death, in 1571, for Arianism; and the synod of Dort, on their inquiry into the dispute between Arminius and Calvin, condemned Grotius to perpetual imprisonment, beheaded the old advocate Barneveldt, and banished numerous families without any notice. Turn we now to our own country. We are, to be sure, much more enlightened than the countries on the continent, an exceedingly intelligent people; but I will tell you about our proceedings when I next get up: my time is now expired.

Mr. BARKER:—

I would just observe, that when Lloyd Jones says he gave the texts of Scripture on which those persecutors up to the eighth century acted, or pretended to act, he states what he knows to be untrue. He did state that Beza, one man only, grounded the doctrine of persecution on one

text; that was all. But he never connected the evil doings of those pretenders to Christianity with any single part of the Gospel, throughout the whole of his bloody speeches. I would further state, that I never meant, and I never stated, that I had read the works of Porphyry and Celsus. I stated that I had seen their objections to Christianity. I read the sentence referred to, and the manuscript from which I read it is present. I have seen the objections where Lloyd Jones says they are to be found, namely, in the quotations made from their works by Origen, and in the fragments scattered up and down the works of the ancient Christian fathers. I cannot stay to expose all Lloyd Jones's mis-statements, or attempts to misrepresent my words; but I think it necessary thus to point out one or two, that you may be upon your guard. With respect to the word "accursed:" in the third verse of the ninth chapter of Romans, Paul, in expressing his great anxiety for the welfare of his Jewish brethren, says, "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren," that is, separated from the public body of Christians, from the privileges of communion with the church,—for the sake of his brethren's advantage, and that they might share those privileges. This is the intrinsic, the correct, and original meaning of the word. How the Popes may have changed the meaning of words is no concern of ours; that is its uniform meaning in the New Testament. As to what the Popes of Rome thought or did, we have nothing whatever to do with it; they never pretended to follow the New Testament alone; they expressly professed to follow something else, they shut up the New Testament in a strange language, and set that something else above and against the New Testament. Not one of the persecutors that has been mentioned ever gave the passage of the New Testament on which he acted; and if he had, as Lloyd Jones properly acknowledged, it would have proved nothing against the system, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, nothing whatever. If a child should get some medicine from a druggist, and instead of applying it externally as a liniment, should swallow it, and be poisoned, an outcry *might* be made



against the medicine, but the mistake would be that of the child. So it is with those who misunderstand some passages of Scripture: one man may misunderstand a single passage, and suppose it to sanction persecutions, but ten thousand times ten thousand have understood it rightly, and, in accordance with the whole tenor of the Gospel, have condemned persecution. But Lloyd Jones says, Calvin and Luther persecuted. We know they did wrong, and we pity them for it, for we know that the truth was sufficient to make its own way; but when he adds that their followers have not condemned their persecutions, he speaks that which is not the truth.

Mr. JONES:—I said their contemporaries.

Mr. BARKER:—All their followers to this day condemn it; they condemn it on scriptural grounds, and quote the passages which authorize its condemnation.

When Scripture was quoted by those persons whom Lloyd Jones mentioned to justify persecution, it was not the New Testament, but from the case of Josiah, who lived under the Old Testament; and we all know that the system of the Old Testament was not and did not profess to be a tolerant system. Christ says, "You have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you." That is the uniform tenor of the New Testament, which is the book that we at present follow, and to which this debate was to be confined. I will give you a few more quotations from this book. "Let love be without dissimulation," says the Apostle; "abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good; be kindly affectioned one to another, with brotherly love, in honour preferring one another: not slothful in business; fervent in spirit, serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing constant in prayer; distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality. Bless them which persecute you; bless and curse not: recompense to no man evil for evil; provide things honest in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you,

live peaceably with all men. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." These are the doctrines of the New Testament. No man is a Christian, except in so far as he conforms to these doctrines. Lloyd Jones calls other people Christians, whose characters were the opposite to those above described; but he cannot prove that they were Christians either in heart or in life. He knows they were not Christians: he knows that he is misrepresenting one of the plainest subjects in the universe, by attributing to our system the effects of another system which we oppose.

He asks, where is the original of the beautiful picture I have drawn of the effects of Christianity? Thank God, many parents here have it in their own houses: many persons present feel it in their own hearts. They also have it to a great extent in the South Sea Islands. The happy effects of Christianity have been seen in different forms, in various parts of the earth. If one of us quote history, why may not the other? And I could quote ten thousand instances of persons professing the Gospel who have loved their enemies, who have not persecuted, but have prayed for those who persecuted them, where Lloyd Jones can produce one who has done otherwise. If Volney, the infidel, was a persecutor, and called himself a Christian, can we help that? According to Lloyd Jones's plan of reasoning, an infidel has nothing to do but kill his fellow men, and say that he understood the New Testament to teach him to do so; and he might then proceed to lay all the murders in the universe upon the Christian Scriptures. It is just the same about Beza: we all know he was mistaken. It requires little learning to know that. The Bible is not so dark as to need an infallible interpreter; all is so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.

In the remark which Lloyd Jones made about Ananias and Sapphira, I was very sorry to see such a wilful perversion of facts. They were not struck dead by the Apostle; nor were they so much as blamed for keeping back part of their property. I will read you the passage:—"But a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife,

sold a possession, and kept back part of the price, his wife also being privy to it, and brought a certain part, and laid it at the Apostles' feet. But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" They were under no obligation to part with it; there was no reason why they should not have continued to possess it, had they so chosen: all was voluntary:—"Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." It was for the *lie* that they were punished; and not for doing as they thought proper with their property. And how were they punished? Did Peter strike them dead? Hear the passage:—"And Ananias hearing these words, fell down, and gave up the ghost; and great fear came on all them that heard these things." I wish all liars would take warning by this solemn judgment.

I would just say that those statements about persecution may be true, but they have nothing to do with the point; and I shall not therefore follow Lloyd Jones any further in this matter. I will proceed to show the influence of Christianity. I was observing, in my last speech, that Christianity struck at the root of all superstition, and wherever it prevailed, swept it away. The Apostle cast out the spirit of divination from a young woman at Philippi, (Acts xvii.) and did away with her wicked gains. Elymas, the sorcerer, was proved, by a mild and merciful judgment, to be an impostor. Great numbers of others were led to abandon their black and mischievous arts; they burned their books, to the value of 50,000 pieces of silver. To such an extent did the Gospel prevail, at the very commencement of its career; and to such an extent did it prove a blessing to the world!

Another effect of Christianity was, that wherever it operated, it overturned the whole system of priestcraft. Priestcraft was another of the greatest curses of the nations of antiquity: the priests possessed great power

over the people's minds, and ruled them with a rod of iron." No nation that I ever heard of was without its priests, and there was not a nation but was in some measure enslaved by them. But how does the Gospel operate? It gives power to no set of men over the consciences of others; it does not form any number of men into a class, and call them priests, but makes all men priests, and puts all on a level. The Redeemer says—"Call no man master upon earth;" that is, submit to no authority but Christ's. "Call no man father, for one is your Father, which is in heaven, even God, and all ye are brethren." Every man is called on to judge for himself, of those things that are proposed to him, which is right. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," says the Apostle. Implicit belief is discouraged throughout the New Testament; men are directed to examine, to weigh, to determine upon conviction; so to believe and obey in their hearts as responsible only unto God. Every man must stand or fall to God; no man is allowed to come in between me and God; no man is my priest; no man can exert God's power, or do my work for me. The New Testament teaches that all men must stand alone on their own merits, and those of Christ Jesus, their Judge and Saviour.

The first preachers were forbid to be lords over God's heritage; they were forbid to take the oversight of their flocks, from motives of a love of power or wealth; they were to help their brethren, not to oppress them; and with a ready mind to promote their proficiency in knowledge, in faith, in lowliness, and joy. Christ is our pattern, the pattern of all Christian ministers, a pattern which we are all commanded to follow; and so far as we follow him, so far are we genuine Christian ministers. All ministers of the Gospel are Christian ministers just so far as they make proficiency in the right knowledge and right practice of Christianity, as taught and exemplified by Jesus Christ. But there was no priestcraft about him, or about his Apostles: they were all simple, open-hearted men: they went forth unarmed with carnal weapons, to publish the truth, to spread the doctrines of universal

charity, which were to regenerate and make all men happy. The true Christian is a free man; he stands erect and independent; he is the boldest and the happiest man in the universe.

Again, wherever Christianity has operated, it has made men peaceful. War was formerly the business of the world. There were vast numbers of slaves before Christianity came, who tilled the ground and did the drudgery, and all the free men were soldiers. The warrior's glory was the height of men's ambition. Then patriotism was a savage, pretended love of country, which gratified itself in extending their country's dominions by the destruction of other nations. Christianity opposed this system of war: it pronounced its blessings on the peace-maker, and gave no encouragement whatever to the warrior. It taught men that the only method by which they ought to rule over each other was by means of truth, and by means of charity; and wherever it has operated, and made men true Christians, it has caused them to be enemies to war. The chief part even of the professing Christians in our country are opposed to war. If a man in the army is converted to Christianity, he strives to leave it instantly. True Christians are not found enlisting into the army or navy; they feel that war is opposed to their principles; and they have established peace societies for spreading the Christian principles of peace throughout the world. More than one sect of Christians have disavowed the propriety or necessity of war under any circumstances. The principles of peace are still prevailing where the Gospel prevails, and they will prevail yet more and more, and one of the great flood-gates of human wretchedness will be thus stopped up. Mankind will in consequence be gainers in commerce, in freedom, and in wealth, and in all the happy fruits of peace. Thus, wherever Christianity operates, it is producing peace on earth, and good-will to men. Christianity has also given us a glorious instance of a whole state where war was excluded. William Penn, a Christian, founded the state of Pennsylvania, in the midst of six savage Indian nations. All other states in similar circumstances

had perpetual war; they held the unchristian principle that war was necessary, and they practised it. Penn would have no war; and in the first place, when he entered into the midst of his people, he would not have their land, until he had bought it, though the King of England had given him it. He would have nothing as the fruit of conquest. He founded a state there, and, for more than seventy years, that state, composed of Christians, subsisted without the help of one single instrument of war, or striking one blow. What was more remarkable, God so protected them under those circumstances, that not a single Quaker was injured, except one who was shot by mistake, when carrying arms to kill wild beasts. Thus peacefully has Christianity operated, where it has been fairly tried; and wherever it is allowed to operate, war must come to an end. It points us to a time when men shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, nor learn war any more. The day is fast approaching, when widows shall no longer weep, and orphans shall not beg their bread, because their husbands and fathers have fallen on the field of battle; but when all men shall enjoy peace, and quietness, and assurance for ever.

Mr. JONES :—

Let me first remark, relative to the observation made by Mr. Barker, that I knew well that these parties, of whom I have been speaking, and who persecuted, were not Christians,—allow me to tell Mr. Barker, that if either he or I had lived at the time, and had said so, we should have paid the penalty of our lives. I do say I am fully persuaded that they were Christians, that they had the Gospel for the ground-work of their persecutions; and that if we had dared to tell them that they had not, or were not Christians, he or I would have been added to the list of martyrs. But Voltaire was a persecutor! Oh, I wonder where Mr. Barker comes by all his valuable information. Allow me to tell Mr. Barker, that when the Catholics and Protestants were persecuting

and utterly destroying each other in the kingdom of France, Voltaire, out of his own purse, built a colony to keep them from each other. Point to a Christian that has done as much; and yet Mr. Barker says Voltaire was a persecutor. When they burned young De la Barre for being an infidel, and broke Calais on the wheel, Voltaire, by his essay on toleration, shook priestcraft to the foundation. It is to Voltaire, and those like him, that we must look for the freedom we now enjoy. Voltaire, he told you last night, did not openly attack the Christian religion, but struck in private. He durst not do any thing more, or he would have shared the fate of De la Barre. Is it not a mockery to hold up a dagger before a man, and then charge him with having worked privately? Had he been allowed to express an opinion, he would have done so. He knocked the idols of bigotry upon the head, and very politely bowed and nodded to them as they tumbled to the ground.

But the Christian religion, we are told, is extremely plain; so plain, that the wayfaring man, and he who runs, may read. This is the first time I ever heard of this discovery. What, I should like to know, is the cause of the difference, not only between wayfaring men, and running men, but men who study? How comes it that Mr. Maguire and Mr. Gregg, in Dublin, were meeting one another in discussion? All are split up into little sections, who each read the Bible differently. But the story of Ananias and Sapphira would be a warning to liars; so it should. But who quoted it in favour of persecution? Beza, as I stated to you before, cited that and other texts in support of his doctrine. Bear that in mind; that comes from a Christian writer, not from Mr. Jones. But Mr. Barker says I told you that up to the eighth century, they quoted texts in favour of persecution. I told you no such thing. I told you they acted as religious men, and persecuted. Beza was the only man that I spoke of quoting them. And I tell you that Bogerman, who translated Beza's work, and was president of the Synod of Dort, recommended it to the magistrates, and his recom-

mendation was acted on. But I have no right to speak of the Popes: Mr. Barker has nothing to do with the Popes. I wish the rest of the world had had nothing to do with the Popes. I am sorry that Mr. Barker cannot destroy the connexion between persecuting Popery, persecuting Protestantism, and the Christian religion.

But then, these persons were mistaken relative to what these passages of Scripture mean. Granting that this is proved, my argument holds good, and it helps Mr. Barker nothing, no more than his illustration about physic: for if a child takes physic, and it kills him, it has produced a bad effect. I am thus giving every latitude in the argument; and I say, that my ground is established in opposition to that of Mr. Barker, and that Christianity has been proved to produce bad effects. He has yet to prove that it is not producing bad effects now; I will prove that it is. But then, Beza was the only one who mistook it. Now, my friends, I like to deal in facts. Only one man was mistaken; very well; let us see what his mistakes led to. By a work called "Thoughts on Toleration," published at Edinburgh, in 1780, we find that the whole number of persons massacred on account of religion, during the space of 1400 years, amounts to—what do you think? Upwards of 50 millions of human beings!

I told Mr. Barker that he misrepresented my language when he spoke of the followers of Calvin. I spoke of his contemporaries; I mentioned Melancthon as one, and quoted his letters to prove, that though most benevolent he did not discountenance these wicked proceedings. Mr. Barker then went on to enumerate the different benefits produced by the Christian religion; and amongst the rest, said it had overturned priestcraft. I wonder you could contain yourselves when you heard that,—that you did not laugh outright. Where? In England, Ireland, Spain, France, Austria, Russia? No. Where, where? In America?—*Nowhere*.—Priestcraft is as rife in the world now as ever it was. It does not assume such a frightful form as before philosophy began to check it; it competed with philosophy as long as it could, but it is now beginning to hide its diminished head. The text I



have quoted from Mark tells you, that you are not to examine the evidence, that you are to have no opportunity of deciding properly. Now this is something like what Mr. Halliwell charges me with ; I wanted to intimidate the umpire. Christ says, "If you believe my doctrines, you shall be saved ; if not, you shall be damned." *Dare* to come to any other *conclusion* than in their *favour*, and you shall be *damned*. There is freedom,—there is toleration, and liberty of mind ! Twist it as you will, put what construction you will upon it, it stands as a sentence, breathing the worst spirit of persecution, not in *time* only, because that may be borne with, or may be escaped from by death ; but the human being is hunted into, and tortured through an endless and never-ceasing *eternity*. But Penn was a Christian ; as I told you last night, what a corner have I driven Mr. Barker into ; he has to run into the wilderness to Penn for a bit of Christianity ; but let me tell him that Penn was driven out of England, because he was not a Christian.

But before I go any further, I will speak of the excursions of the Spaniards into South America, and of the manner in which they propagated their religion. Here, again, the cruelties practised were almost too horrid to enumerate. Mr. Barker may well call my speeches bloody speeches ; but I ask again, who furnished that blood ? Who created the bloody records, through which I am going ? Christians. And it is because I detest such proceedings that I am exposing them, in order that you may avoid them. "Forth they went," says Howitt, "bearing on their banner the figure of a large cross, and this inscription, 'Let us follow the cross, for under this sign we shall conquer.'" But Christianity is doing away with wars : I wonder, again, you did not laugh when Mr. Barker told you so. "What half century has produced more wars than the last ? How many Waterloos do the annals of the earth reckon ?" Yet we are told that it has done away with war. "So powerfully," says Robertson, in his history, "were Cortez and his followers animated with both these passions (religion and avarice,) that, no less eager to plunder the

opulent country whither they were bound, than zealous to propagate the Christian faith among its inhabitants, they set out, not with the solicitude natural to men going upon dangerous services, but with that confidence which arises from security of success, and certainty of *divine* protection." "In his march through the country, from Cholula towards Mexico, six thousand people were butchered in cold blood; two days were employed in hewing down trembling wretches, too fearful to even raise a single weapon against the murderers." "He ordered the great temple to be cleared from the gore of his murdered victims, and raised there the standard of the cross; after giving the Cholulans, as he did all the other people among whom he stopped, some idea of the Christian religion!" Mr. Howitt very justly remarks, "What idea had he of Christianity himself?" To use the emphatic language of Montgomery,

"The cross their standard, but their faith the sword;

"Their steps were graves; o'er prostrate realms they trod;

"They worshipped Mammon, while they vowed to God."

These, then, were the men who went to plant the cross among the heathen; and what do we find? We find that Peru and Mexico, two great flourishing countries, were steeped in the blood of forty millions of their sons! They came, they saw, they conquered: they enslaved, and they destroyed. They scarcely left a soul to breathe. The attention of Europeans was then turned to Africa. "They had seized on almost all countries, but they could not seize on the torrid regions of Africa. They could not seize the land, but they could seize the people, They could not destroy them in their own sultry clime, fatal to the white men; they therefore determined to immolate them on the graves of the already perished Americans."

I come now to your own proceedings. I will begin with the history of the Protestant Church, and will run over it as soon as I can, because the time is very short. Cranmer's hands were stained with the blood of several. He had a share in the condemnation of John Lambert, and consented to the death of Ann

Askew, who were burnt for denying the Corporeal Presence, as we find from Burnett's history. Joan Bocher, in 1549, was executed through Cranmer's instrumentality; and about two years after, George Van Pare, a Dutchman, was burned in Smithfield, for saying that Christ was not *very* God. Eleven Dutchmen, who were Anabaptists, were condemned to the fire for heresy: nine were banished, and two were burnt alive, in Smithfield. In the year 1583, Copping and Thacker, two Puritan ministers, were hanged for nonconformity. The laity, if they published books against the prelacy, had their ears cut off, their noses split, and were tortured in various ways.

In the reign of Anne, dissenters were prohibited from teaching schools, or being tutors in private families. I now turn to the persecutions of the Puritans, in America,—those people who, Mr. Barker says, did not persecute at all; but just allow me to tell you what they did in England. Under the Commonwealth, when they had power in their own hands, in the time of Cromwell, the dissenters expelled from their livings no less than ten thousand Church of England clergymen. Clarendon and the bishops, in Charles the Second's reign, imprisoned and murdered eight thousand dissenters, ruined thousands of families, drove multitudes abroad, and robbed them of from twelve to fourteen millions of property. So much for the kind spirit existing then: we will now follow them over to New England. It is a disagreeable task to enter into these details; but I have set it for myself, and I will faithfully perform it. In Boston, in 1656, the Puritans passed a law to banish from the colony the followers of Penn, whereby it was enacted, that "whosoever of the inhabitants should, directly or indirectly, cause any of the Quakers to come into that jurisdiction, he should forfeit one hundred pounds to the country, and be committed to prison, there to remain till the penalty should be satisfied; and whosoever should entertain them, knowing them to be so, should forfeit forty shillings to the country for every hour's entertainment, and be committed to prison till the forfeiture

should be fully paid and satisfied. And, further, that all and every of those people that should arise amongst them there, should be dealt withal and suffer the like punishment as the laws provided for those that came in; viz. that for the first offence, if a male, one of his ears should be cut off, and he be kept at work in the house of correction till he should be sent away at his own charge. For the second, the other ear, and be kept in the house of correction as aforesaid. If a woman, then to be severely whipped, and kept as aforesaid as well, for the first; and for the second offence, to be dealt withal as the first. And for the third, he or she should have their tongues bored through with an hot iron, and kept in the house of correction close at work, till they be sent away at their own charge."

There, what do you think of that as a specimen of Puritan persecution,—the people who, according to Mr. Barker, did not persecute! They were dissenters, who had the Scriptures, and understood them. Extremely good and kind-hearted people they must have been, when all they did on behalf of religion was to cut off the ears of the Friends, and bore their tongues through with hot irons. And, in pursuance of the before-mentioned law, "one William Brend, and one William Leddra, were committed to the house of correction at Boston, where they were kept five days without food, and after that received twenty blows each with a three-corded whip. The next day Brend, who was an elderly man, was put in irons, and tied neck and heels close together for sixteen hours. The next morning the jailer took a pitched rope, about an inch thick, and gave him twenty blows over the back and arms, with as much force as he could, so that the rope untwisted. But he fetched another thicker and stronger, and gave him fourscore and seventeen more blows, and threatened to give him as many more the next morning. Brend had nothing on but a serge cassock over his shirt, so that his back and arms were grievously bruised, and the blood hung as in bags under his arms; so cruelly was his body mangled, that it was reduced almost to a perfect jelly."

Mr. BARKER:—

That individuals who profess Christianity, and are even sincere in their profession, may not understand the whole of religion, is readily acknowledged. We have to mourn, that the New Testament, to which they ought to appeal for direction, is not more read and more attended to. But the Gospel is not chargeable with the crimes of those who neglect its teachings. We can only repeat the truth, that where the New Testament is most read and best known, persecution is there at its lowest ebb; where it is least known and least regarded, persecution rages most violently. The laws that have been already quoted were abrogated a long time ago, through the influence of Christians who paid more attention than their forefathers to the authority of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and who were more actuated by Christian principles. With respect to the Spaniards in South America, the explanation that Lloyd Jones has given of their conduct, in the quotation from Montgomery, is perfectly satisfactory: they were worshippers of Mammon, and only talked of God. Now, as Christ said, "No man can serve two masters; ye cannot serve both God and Mammon;" if men serve Mammon, they are opposed to God, and to the Christian religion too; and such men may well persecute.

But we are told that the infidel philosophers have done away with persecution. The best writings, and the earliest in favour of toleration, were by Christian authors who lived before Voltaire. Locke wrote before, and better than Voltaire; Voltaire borrowed from him his best arguments, and added only abuse and blasphemy of his own. Jeremy Taylor wrote his *Liberty of Prophecy*, long before these infidel writers wrote their works. The infidel writers never ventured to express their thoughts publicly, until Christians had prepared the way, and secured toleration. With respect to Waterloo, and the great numbers who have fallen in late wars, who does not know that these wars originated in the schemes of the infidel French philosophers? The horrors of the French revolution were nothing more than the Socialist system, carried out to its proper length of obscenity, profligacy,

impiety, and cruelty. As to the Spaniards in South America, it is very likely they never read the Gospel; there is no proof that they did; if they had read it, and attended to it, they would have learnt not to persecute even those who might persecute them.

I will now proceed to state the happy influence exerted by Christianity wherever it has operated. Where are its effects to be found? I am asked. I answer, wherever it has operated. But before I enter fully on this subject, I will read you one passage from a work of Robert Owen, to show you that war may spring from other principles than from mistaken notions about Christianity. Robert Owen makes no profession of Christianity, yet he expressly enjoins the warlike system upon all his followers. When speaking of the formation of communities, he says—"Were all men trained to be rational, the art of war would be rendered useless. While, however, any part of mankind shall be taught that they form their own characters, and continue to be trained from infancy to think and to act irrationally"—

Mr. CONNARD :—You must keep to the question.

Mr. HALLIWELL :—The interruption now comes from Lloyd Jones's Chairman; and Mr. Barker is called to the question for citing from Robert Owen's works, to prove that other parties encourage a warlike spirit besides the parties whom Lloyd Jones chooses to call Christians. Now, if argument can be fairly pursued at all, I think that is a fair mode of arguing; at least, it is in my judgment. I am quite willing that the matter should be submitted to the umpire; his decision will be final; but so far as my opinion goes, I think the interruption was uncalled for, and totally out of place.

Mr. JONES :—You had better withdraw it. Go on, Mr. Barker.

Mr. BARKER :—I was going to show that people can practise war and use arms, from other principles than from mistaken Christianity. He says—"So long as any remain irrational, even the most rational must, for their personal security, learn the means of defence; and every community of such rational characters, while surrounded

by men who have been thus improperly taught, should acquire a knowledge of this destructive art, that they may be enabled to *over-rule* the actions of irrational beings, and maintain the peace. To accomplish these objects to the utmost practical limit, and with the least inconvenience, every male should be instructed how best to defend, when attacked, the community to which he belongs."

He then proceeds to require every man to be furnished with and learn the use of fire arms and other arms, and says that they must be taught also to practise and to understand the more complicated military movements. "The boys," says he, "will be taught to consider this art as absolutely rendered necessary by the partial insanity of some of their fellow creatures; that its use is to restrain the violence of such madmen, to prevent the evil consequences of the acts of the insane, and, if possible, cure them of their disease:"\* that is, bring us all, by force of arms, to turn infidel Socialists. This is the most wholesale system of war and intimidation I ever heard of.

I would observe, that all those persecutions, and all those wars that have been referred to Christianity, originate in those lusts, as the Apostle James says, to which men yield themselves,—the lust of fame, the lust of wealth, and the lust of power, all of which Christianity condemns and destroys.

Christianity, wherever it has operated, has also produced happy effects in domestic life. Women used to be ill-treated and abused; wives were bought and sold; and several were possessed by one man. Under the influence of infidel principles, men would abandon their wives without regret, would seduce their wives' sisters, and give themselves up to all kinds of profligacy. Christianity, wherever it was embraced, produced a complete change: it taught a man to unite himself to one wife, and to love her as his own flesh. Wherever it has prevailed, it has

\* "Essays on the Formation of the Human Character. By Robert Owen." Pages 47-48.

produced similar effects on parents and children, and has taught all who come under its influence, that they should be one in affection and in interest, and should delight in promoting each other's happiness.

Christianity has also taught men truth and integrity, has taught them to act on principles of strict fidelity and punctuality to their engagements; and wherever we find a true Christian, we find a man who, without an oath, is firm to his word, and steady to his engagements.

Christianity was the first system that taught men to provide for the poor. Before it came into the world, hospitals for the sick and alms-houses for the poor were not heard of; the poor were universally neglected; priests, philosophers, and governments, all neglected them.

In the renowned works of those ancient philosophers that have done so much good, according to Lloyd Jones, there is not a word of pity for the poor. I have read Seneca and Cicero, the great philosophers of Rome, and Epictetus and several others of the Greek philosophers, but more of the Latin philosophers, and I do not find a word in them about pity for the poor. All their beneficence was an interchange of favours with those that needed none. Christianity looked especially to the poor; it brought glad tidings to the poor and blessed them. The poor who welcomed the truth were made happy by its influence. The Christian churches, from the beginning, provided for the poor: officers were set apart to look over and relieve the sick, the fatherless, the widows, and the destitute. Up to this period, the Christian churches still maintain their poor; the Wesleyans, the New Connexion, and the Quakers especially maintain their poor, or see them supported. These are our laws; and wherever Christianity operates, it teaches every man to make the poor man's interest his own.

Christianity has also had a happy effect upon our laws and public institutions. Nothing was more common than slavery, formerly: one man in Rome, that boasted seat of philosophy and liberty, had no fewer than twenty thousand slaves; and in some of the states of Greece, the land of freedom, there were twenty slaves to one freeman." Christianity



put it into the hearts of men to emancipate their slaves. Documents exist which show that men, on receiving Christianity, emancipated their slaves; and assigned as their reason, that the Gospel had taught them, that, as they were all the children of one heavenly Father, and were brethren in Christ, they ought not to hold their brethren in bondage. Christianity has abolished the slave trade. When Christians first undertook the agitation against the slave trade, the infidels said, "Oh, let the blacks alone; the negroes are not men; their minds are not formed like ours;" the Christians contended that they were of the same flesh and blood, and that they ought to be treated like men, and the slave trade was accordingly abolished. Wilberforce, and Clarkson, who is still living, were the first advocates of the injured slave, and the unwearied opponents of the slave trade and of slavery generally, were Christians: I do not say they were perfect, but they were infinitely beyond what they would have been without Christianity. The Christians of this country it was that petitioned for the emancipation of the slaves; and it was the public opinion, impregnated with Christianity, that swept aside that system of cruelty and injustice. And wherever Christianity effectually operates, it produces the same effect. It has not operated every where, it is true; it has not operated freely upon the infidels, for they do their utmost to resist it: but wherever it does operate,—and it operates extensively in spite of them,—it produces peace on earth, and good-will to men.

I now proceed to show that it not only produces good, but good of every kind: and that my enumeration of good things may be as complete as possible, I will read a list of things necessary to happiness, as given by the Socialists themselves. It is from the Socialists' Bible, and considering that it comes from men who pretend to know nothing of God or heaven, and who look no higher than the clouds, and no farther than the present hour, it is a tolerably good list. We shall find that Christianity tends to put all these things deemed requisite to human happiness, within our reach. The first requisite here specified, is a good organization, physical, mental,

and moral. Let a man live as Christianity dictates; let him be temperate and industrious, and his whole constitution will be benefitted, and his offspring are sure to come into the world under the most favourable circumstances, both with respect to their body and their mind, as well as their moral faculties.

Another requisite is, the power to procure all that is necessary to life, and to preserve the whole system in health, such as food, exercise, and knowledge. Now Christianity has given that power, in a greater measure than ever it was possessed previous to its promulgation, and has extended it to those who never possessed it before. Look at New Zealand: there the power to provide food is limited to the supply of a hundred thousand people. Look, on the other hand, on Great Britain, an island of similar extent: we have the power to raise food for at least ten millions; and let Christianity have its full influence, and it will give us power to obtain food for the whole of our population, and with far less labour, too, than is necessary now. This is its tendency—to give plenty, without excessive labour; and to this it will bring the world. It also gives to men the means of knowledge. When men become Christians, they become temperate and economical, and, along with the means of procuring books, this gives the opportunities of reading them, by enabling them to do with fewer hours of labour. Thus, Christianity furnishes thousands and tens of thousands in our own country, with the means of raising themselves above a state of ignorance, and acquiring a knowledge both of the things of this world, and of the things pertaining to the world to come.

The next requisite to happiness is a good education for the physical, moral, and intellectual powers. Christianity gives us this. The best system of education is to be found amongst professing Christians. Children are often reared by them, when none else could rear them. Amongst them we find ten children raised, while not more than five, or perhaps six at most, are reared amongst those who pay no respect to Christianity. In religious bodies, it is a principle to teach every child to read, and generally to

write well, so that they may be afterwards able both to instruct themselves and to instruct others.

Another requisite is the inclination and the means to promote the happiness of our fellow-beings. Christianity begets this inclination in every one that comes under its influences; from first to last its principle is love,—love is the fulfilment of the whole Gospel. Wherever you find a man who feels the power of the Gospel, you find one who is wishful to communicate his blessedness to others. As to the means of promoting the happiness of others, it gives them also. It gives us power; it gives us influence in society; it gives us knowledge, and in some cases wealth: it blesses us every way, and fits us for blessing others. Who are the men that are blessing the world at this moment? The followers of Jesus Christ.

The next requisite is the inclination and the means of increasing the general stock of knowledge. The inclination to obtain knowledge, is as much a part of the Christian's disposition, as the inclination for doing good. It make us wishful to understand all useful truth. And it gives us the means of knowing. We can search the heavens, we can go back to the past, we can penetrate the future, and traverse the whole world. Who but Christians have taken the lead in all the paths of science? Our best poets, historians, and philosophers, have been Christians. Such men as Bacon, Newton, Boyle, Locke, and Clarke, and all the most eminent names in our history were Christians. The best men and the greatest writers of the present day are still, in some measure, under the influence of Christianity, and owe their dignity of mind to the influence of Christian principle. Lancaster and Raikes, the founders of improved Day-schools and Sunday-schools, were Christians. Under the influence of Christianity, knowledge has taken the wings of the wind, and is flying to all the ends of the earth. And thanks be to God, we look forward to the time, when our knowledge, which is here scanty and imperfect, shall be perfected in heaven. Here we cannot know all; knowledge is long, and life is short. The infidel may attain a little knowledge, but on his system he soon forgets it. We shall go on learning

for ever, until we get to comprehend the infinite, and to know even as we are known. I wish all my infidel friends could indulge in the same hope.

Another requisite is, the means of enjoying the best society, and more particularly, of associating at pleasure with those for whom we feel the most regard and the greatest affection. So far as this is attainable, Christianity puts it within our reach. Christianity makes good society, by regenerating men, and uniting us together in bonds of brotherly love. A truly Christian church is as one body; and if Lloyd Jones had a heart to feel, and could be among us, he would find that truly Christian society is a heaven begun on earth. But in heaven we shall have the society of good and wise men to perfection, and on earth we have much pleasure resulting from this hope also.

The next requisite is, the means of travelling at pleasure. Christianity does a little towards this; for it encourages all laudable efforts to improve and multiply the useful arts, and countenances every thing which can promote the temporal as well as the spiritual interests of men.

Another requisite is, to be delivered from superstition, from supernatural fears, and from the fear of death. Christianity entirely delivers us from superstition; it teaches us that there is one God, the governor of the world, and that when we do his will, and trust to his wisdom, we are safe. His eye is over us by day, and he watches over us by night; and like as a father pities his children, so he pities them that fear him: he has promised to guide us by his counsel, and then to receive us to glory. We have no superstitions; and as to supernatural fears, the true Christian fears nothing; he does not fear even infidels. He knows that God can overrule all things for good. Though Voltaire set up a press to publish infidel works, and crush the cause of Christ, even that was overruled by God for good; and now, through the influence of Christianity, that very press is at the present moment employed in printing Bibles, and is thus spreading a knowledge of that truth which Voltaire intended to have overthrown. Again: as to the fear of death, we are

delivered from that also. Unlike the infidel, we have not even to fear annihilation,—the death of feeling, the death of hope, the death of consciousness. We dread no such horrible event as a return to nothingness. We live, and we expect to live for ever, and we hope to live in everlasting glory, where all our tears will be for ever wiped away, and where we shall rejoice with all our happy friends, in joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Mr. JONES:—

Mr. Barker first set out by speaking of the wars, the murders, and the crimes to which I have alluded; and he tells you that Socialism had produced them, that it was the Socialists who had done them. Well, I have no objection that Mr. Barker should say so; but the thing appears so extremely ridiculous, that I will leave it there, for I am quite well aware that such vague assertions as that will produce no effect on your minds. Suppose Mr. Barker chooses to charge our society with being guilty of all these crimes; I say that Christianity has done it, and I will there leave it.

Mr. HALLIWELL:—You are mistaken; Mr. Barker did not say so; he did not say Socialism, but Infidelity.

Mr. JONES:—Well, Infidelity; I thought I heard Socialism mentioned. Then he finds fault with Robert Owen for wishing his followers to arm. But that passage answers itself. It is merely necessary while they are surrounded by madmen, who fought the battles of Waterloo and other places, who fell by the sword in Spain, and are doing it now in Canada. But infidelity is complained of by Mr. Barker, as having countenanced many crimes; men have run away with their sisters, and done many bad things. I am sorry that Mr. Barker forgot to tell you that there were eighty thousand women in the metropolis living on the wages of prostitution. Let us not throw the stone of opprobrium at our neighbours, unless we are aware that we have no glass windows of our own.

But no party, he says, ever made provision for the poor until Christianity did it. Mr. Barker has read

Cicero, Seneca, and I don't know how many of the ancient philosophers; but he must have read them with very queer eyes. Did he ever read of agrarian laws? If he has, he must have read of a provision made for the poor by the division of conquered lands. I wonder he has not read with a little more exactness.

But Christianity has destroyed slavery. Now, let us try that question. I like to deal in facts, not in imaginations; as Sam Weller says, "it verges a little on the poetical." If Christianity destroyed slavery, Christian slave-holders compelled us to give twenty millions of money first. What does George Thompson tell us? That houses of worship, in the southern states, are endowed with slaves, who are let out at so much a day; and he says they are the worst used of all the slaves in America, because those who hire them out whip as much work out of them as they can, and then send them back again, to be hired to the next bidder. Mr. Barker, has Christianity destroyed slavery there? A Methodist conference was held in Cincinnati in 1836; the Rev. Dr. Bangs, in a letter to the *New York Journal of Commerce*, said—"I rejoice to see so much good temper manifested on a question so exciting; and I hope it may terminate in peace. Abolition, as it is now technically called, has few advocates in conference; and it will be condemned by a very strong vote." So it was: one hundred and twenty-three Methodist ministers voted against it, and only fourteen for it. But I will come home, and ask Mr. Barker, has Christianity destroyed white slavery in the factories? No. There it exists, palpable and real; and we may view numbers of our fellow creatures dwindling into deformity, and pining into old age, before, by rights, they should have arrived at maturity. This we see around us; and it has been stated, as the result of an inquiry into the circumstances of the population of the West Riding of Yorkshire, and Lancashire, that there are five hundred thousand people subsisting upon twopence farthing a day. But let us follow these Christians to the South Sea Islands. I would tell Mr. Barker that Horton James, who subscribed to a very large amount

to the schemes of the Methodist missionaries, followed them out to these islands. He says that the population who, in the days of Captain Cook, were healthy and numerous, are dwindled to almost nothing; and although horses are plentiful, he saw the Methodist minister seated on the shoulders of four black men, his fellow Christians, and probably, his fellow-communicants on the Sunday. Now this is on authority, and good authority,—not the authority of the Methodist minister, but of a gentleman who was favourable to the scheme, and who had subscribed to a large amount of money towards it.

But he says, if I had a heart to feel, I should be glad of the practical benefits of religion. A thing must appear lovely to me, before I can embrace it or love it. Christianity has never yet assumed that form in this country. Let it acquire the quality of love, and I will be one of the first, if I conceive it to be lovely, to embrace it. But when I see it as I have depicted it to you, (and I have given you authority for every statement I have made,) I cannot love it, I cannot embrace it. Show me your works by your faith, and I will show you my faith by my works. It is not to vague declarations and statements that I refer; but to things which you see and know. Christianity, we are told, has destroyed sorcery and witchcraft. It is not fond of witches now; but a hundred years ago it very much adhered to them; and one of the greatest luminaries of the Christian bench, Judge Hale, executed a number of old women at Bury St. Edmunds. But the spread of knowledge has done away with that. Christianity hugged the delusion to her bosom as long as she could; she had her own Witch of Endor for an example; but philosophy tore it from her grasp, or she would have been hugging it to her bosom at this day.

Oh, but you have Voltaire's printing press. I wish you luck with it; Voltaire did good with it while he had it; but there are hundreds at work now. There is toleration now, but not perfect toleration. I received word from Leamington, last night, that one of our Socialist missionaries had been obliged to fly through the window of

the room where he was lecturing. It happened to be looking over the works of John Wesley, the other day, and I found that he and a man named Taylor were pelted out of Sheffield; and that at Wednesbury he was dragged through the streets, his clothes torn, and his person abused. Very well: now, one would have thought that John Wesley was a very meek man. So he was; and what a pity it is that all the Christians existing at the time were not bound in one bond of brotherhood. But before the dirt was well rubbed off his coat,—before his wounds were healed, he turned round, and wrote against his Catholic fellow-subjects; the Anti-Catholic Association found in him a tool to work their purposes. He wrote a letter concerning the principles of the Roman Catholics, and in defence of the Anti-Catholic Association; and the only discrepancy between the spirit breathed there and that of John Knox, is, that John Wesley could not raise the same number of sanguinary followers as Knox did. John Wesley had the spirit of persecution within him; and his followers have it, so far as they can show it. For in 1829,—and I am now coming home,—I saw their petition in the porch of their chapel door, Oldham-street, Manchester, superintended by the chapel servants,—a petition against the liberties of their Catholic fellow-subjects.

Mr. Barker, to be sure, is himself a complete personification of charity, there is no doubt of that; a spirit of benevolence breathes through all he has to say. Now, my friends, listen. Mr. Barker published “A few Hints on various Subjects;” and to the word “unobjectionable” he gives this explanation:—“Christianity is unobjectionable, that is true; and it is the only system of which so much can be truly said. It is not in Persia nor in China, at Athens or at Rome, that aught worthy of comparison with the Gospel can be found. Zoroaster and Confucius, the philosophers of Greece and Italy, must bow the knee to Jesus. As for those pretended wise men who of late have appeared in England, France, and Italy, from Herbert down to that *nasty thing* Carile, they stand as far below him as does hell below heaven.” There is a specimen of that pure spirit of benevo-



lence, charity, and kindly feeling for the mistakes of our fellow-creatures, — “*that nasty thing* Carlile!” He says we are unprincipled men, governed by lust. There is the “*charity that thinketh no evil.*” Speaking of Voltaire he says—“One of the *biggest* and most *abominable liars* that ever lived.” There is charity again; how it breathes through all he has to say! Mr. Barker, it is a mockery; you have not this charity. It was not exhibited in the first century, nor the second. I have tracked you from that time down to the present day, and now, *out of your own mouth I condemn you.*

It is very well to vaunt of this when you come before the public; but it is in its assertion and embodiment in conduct that we are to look for principle: principle abstracted from action is not worth a pin’s head. Show me your principles when in action, and I will say they are good if your actions are good. But while your actions are what I have described, I say your principles are a nonentity, a mockery. I have pointed out to you that the stones of your huge fabric are cemented together by blood. You have given texts out of the Scripture, and have referred to things without a date, but have given no proofs. The texts lay within the covers of an old book, but have no existence in reality, no effect on practice. It is with principle embodied in human conduct that I have to deal.

I have a few minutes more to speak. I would say, that although Mr. Halliwell might consider Mr. Barker right, when attempting to prove that other systems had done evil besides Christianity, I say that that has nothing to do with the question. Mahomedanism may have done evil; other systems may have done evil; but it is Christianity that we are talking about to night. After the discussion is finished, I will meet him on our principles if he likes. But he says that we dread a return to nothingness. I tell Mr. Barker that we do not know what lies entombed in eternity,—when we depart from this world, what awaits us; but this we know, that whatever there may be in another world, whatever description of Being may exist in eternity, if we have lived the life of good

citizens,—been good parents, good husbands, good brothers, and good sons, I have too good an opinion of the Divinity to suppose that he will damn me because I do not believe in some dark dogma which I cannot understand.

This, then, is my religion,—Do good to every man,—love every man,—place yourselves in such a position, that every man may love you: do this, and then upon your death-bed you may rest yourselves secure in the hands of that wise Power which has brought you into existence, and which will take you out. I am afraid of nothing myself: I stand before the world as one desirous to injure no man, whatever opprobrium may be cast upon me. I may be told that I am actuated by lust; I tell you that I will brave your prejudices to do good; and in the hour of death I shall throw myself, with the fullest reliance, on the treatment I shall receive from that Being into whose hands I shall fall. I dread nothing, I fear nothing; I love every one, and in that I find security whenever I may go, or wherever I may go, from hence.

Mr. BARKER :—

I would urge all present to read the New Testament for themselves. What Lloyd Jones has said, that he has confined himself to what was done by Christians, or, as he ought to have expressed it, by parties who *called themselves* Christians, is true. He has done just so: all his arguments refer to that one point: he has not said a word about Christianity as taught in the New Testament, though we agreed to make that book our only standard. I may say, that had I only known Christianity from what he has stated of it, or had I only studied it as I found it imperfectly exhibited in the characters or writings of some professing Christians, I too could not have loved it. Or if I had only read what infidels have said about it, instead of reading the Scriptures themselves, I too might have yielded to infidelity. Indeed, there was a time when I looked at Christianity as it is misrepresented by infidels and false pretenders to Christianity, and I had almost turned infidel myself; but, thank God, I

went to the fountain head ; I read the New Testament ; I looked on Christianity as unfolded there, in the examples and doctrine of its first teachers, and I found it to be—what I still find it to be—THE TRUTH. The New Testament has truth without any mixture of error for its contents ; it makes us wise, it teaches us to do good ; this is its sole end and tendency, and whoever yields to its teachings, it makes holy and useful,—happy for time, and happy for eternity. I am not answerable for you ; but I wish you well, and I would have you, when the business of this meeting is over, to sit down to a careful and rigid examination of the New Testament. If you do that once or twice in a proper manner, you will be enlightened and directed ; your souls will be struck with the purity, and tenderness, and simplicity of the Gospel system ; and unless your hearts are set against the truth, you will be convinced in your own consciences, that the religion of Christ is from God. I hope you will thus examine the subject, and I pray that God's blessing may rest on you all.

One passage has been repeatedly quoted by Lloyd Jones ; I mean, that "charity thinketh no evil." This, of course, does not refer to those thoughts and judgments about things over which we have no control ; charity does not hinder men from thinking that falsehood is falsehood. The simple meaning is, that charity plans or purposeth no evil : that would be sin ; but there is no sin in thinking things to be what they are, and in speaking of them accordingly. I feel thankful that in this sense, I think no evil ; I purpose no evil to any one ; charity does not purpose evil.

Allusion has been made to my pamphlet. The meeting may see that that is an illustration of what I stated in a former speech, that when we come into the school of Christ, we do not learn every lesson in a day. Have I made use of any such expressions in this discussion with Lloyd Jones ? I thank God, Christianity has taught me my duty better and better every year, and it is still my wish to leave the things that are behind, and to go on to those that are before. Before I fell under the influence

of the Gospel, I was a savage, as my father, here present, can testify: I hope I have not spoken as a savage to-night. The Gospel has softened my temper, and the power of the Gospel to produce this change in all who yield to its influences, is most abundant.

But it is said that there are 80,000 prostitutes in London. But is it Christianity that has sent them there? Are they persons who read the Scriptures and practise them, that have made them or sent them thither? I will tell you who have probably sent them thither. Rousseau, the great infidel Socialist, had five children, and he exposed them all in the street, leaving them unprotected to the contamination of the world, and some of them might become prostitutes, and go to London. An infidel in my neighbourhood had four children born to him about the same time, by four different young women, to none of whom he was married; and some of these seduced and injured creatures might go to London. Another infidel and Socialist, of whom I lately heard, seduced his wife's sister, and abandoned his wife, and they might become prostitutes and go to London. Many of these abandoned characters may have come from infidel France, or from families where the Bible is not read. Christianity teaches purity; it does not lead any astray, but recovers such as have wandered from the right path. It is to the filthy working of infidel and licentious principles that we are to trace the prevalence of prostitution.

With respect to what Lloyd Jones stated about white slaves, it is because the influence of Christianity does not prevail as it ought throughout the country, that these evils exist; the spirit and love of Christ would sweep them all away. The Gospel has done much for thousands already; it has done much for every heart that has opened itself to receive it; and if we all receive it, it will make us a nation of free, happy, intelligent, and philosophical beings, too; it will make us happy in time, and give us a well-grounded confidence of happiness for eternity. White slavery is not caused by the Gospel. My poor friends, working men, I would impress upon you the necessity of searching diligently what the New Testa-

ment teaches: read it attentively, and practise it, and I will be bound that you will find out the path to happiness. It will not give you happiness in your sins; it will require you to leave them. That is the great difficulty it has to labour against: it cannot make people happy unless they become good. But be good, be willing to try to obey its precepts, and it will make you happy without fail. And it is the only thing that will make you happy. Government will never help you; it can do nothing for you, unless you help yourselves by embracing Christianity. Socialism will not help you; all that the Socialists even propose to do is to form you into a community, and furnish you with animal and sensual indulgences, and they can never do even this; and even if they could, it would not make you happy. But Christianity will make you happy every way. Give yourselves to religion, and that will make you your own reformers, the framers of your own happiness, and in some respects your own governors. Lloyd Jones has quoted a hundred (he might have quoted a thousand) dreadful histories to frighten you from religion, but none of them had any connection with the Gospel; the Gospel would have prevented all such cruelties, if its precepts had been practised.

As to his libels on the Christianity community, his assertions that we are all bloody men together, &c., I can only say, that I wish he knew us better: but I do feel gratified by the reflection, that these slanders have been uttered in a neighbourhood where 300,000 people know them to be lies,—direct and palpable untruths.

With respect to the press, I would not persecute one infidel man on earth; infidels shall have all the power they can get, but where they have one printing press in their service, we have twenty. We have printing presses employed in the advancement of religion in every part of the country; and our associations for the spread of the Gospel are rapidly increasing. We are publishing the truth in more than a hundred languages; and we are forming plans to supply with good books every nation on the face of the earth. And we shall go on and prosper in our schemes. Infidels cannot stop us. The serpent that

bites our heels only makes us run the faster : and the temporary movements of the corrupting systems of infidelity, will only give fresh ardour to our zeal, and make us labour the harder, till we have converted the last soul to God. Never, until then, will they stay our progress. We were born to conquer the world ; the world is the heritage of Christ, and he will vindicate his right, by bringing all men to a knowledge and belief of the truth.

I would once more press on every individual the necessity of examining the subject for himself. Religion is every thing to man. Allow not yourselves to be robbed or cheated of this treasure. Blot out Christianity, and the sun and moon and stars of the moral world, will be darkened for ever. Do away with Christianity, and you stop up the fountain of living waters, and dry up the only stream that can refresh the fainting and perishing sons of men. Blot out religion, and you will have done for the moral world just what you would do for the natural world, if you could blot out and annul the first great laws of nature : all would be darkness and disorder ; earth would be a chaos, and every living thing would die. But let religion spread its light and influence,—let the knowledge of God be universally made to prevail, and light, and happiness, and freedom, and plenty, and heaven will be the portion of mankind. I glory in the Gospel, and am prepared to defend it against all the infidels in the world. The only arguments that can be brought against it are those we have heard in this place ; and even they are not against the Gospel, for they all go to prove how much need we have of the Gospel, to amend men's hearts and to reform their lives. Lloyd Jones's long and dismal dissertations show the need we have to learn and practise it more and more ; and I hope soon, either while I live on earth, or when safely fixed in heaven, to see the world happy under the influence of universal, Christian benevolence.

I leave these remarks with you. As to what may be advanced after I have sat down, I shall not have an opportunity of replying to it to-night ; but it may be necessary for me to give a lecture at a future period, and if I can

have this room, I will do it next Saturday evening ; in order to set the people right as to a number of infidel fallacies that may have imposed upon the minds of unthinking individuals. At present, I would say, let any individual who can find fault in the Gospel, come forward and declare it ; and I will answer him : but there is not one in the universe that can do it. Whatever faults exist in connexion with religion, belong to the men who profess it, and not to religion. You may find many faults in me ; I find them myself, but Christianity is not to blame for my faults. Christianity teaches me to acknowledge and correct them. Christianity is a pure system, full of benevolence,—benevolence that is universal in its extent, which takes in every man, seeking the greatest happiness of the whole human race, and that gives effect to its ardent longings for their welfare, not in mere words, but in vigorous and ceaseless efforts, and in liberal and costly sacrifices for the world's regeneration and salvation. It is a system full of blessings, both for the bodies and the souls of men. Its tendency is to bless all mankind, and to bless them in every way. It softens down the asperities of governments, and improves the institutions of the country. There is not a bad institution in the land that the Gospel does not condemn ; not a good institution, that the Gospel does not support. There is not a bad man, that the Gospel is not adapted to make good, nor a good man, that the Gospel does not make better ; there is not an evil under which man labours, but what the Gospel removes, not a blessing that man can desire, but the Gospel gives him ; there is not an obstacle to his hopes or enjoyment of happiness, but the Gospel has the power to remove. Like its author, it is Almighty, and can save all, and save to the very uttermost. It is the loveliest offspring of heaven, and the best friend of man. In the truth and excellence of its moral principles, in the power of its doctrines, and in the irresistible nature of its evidence, and the happy effects which it produces, it is like to God that gave it. It comes from heaven, and it leads to heaven. It brings down heaven into the hearts of those who receive it, and it lifts up those who are

faithful to its teachings to the heaven of heavens, for ever.

However much men may be enraged against the Gospel, no man can say a word against it, without being either a mistaken man, or the maker and utterer of a lie. It stands on a rock; the floods may roll, and the winds may blow against it, but it can never be shaken. It has a thousand advocates abler than I, and thousands more are coming up, year after year, and its own character and influence are greater advocates still. "We may perish, but the Gospel remaineth; we are but flesh, and all flesh is grass, and the goodness of man is but as the flower of the field. The grass withereth, and the flower fadeth, but the word of the Lord endureth for ever: and this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached to you."\* It is firmer than the pillars of heaven, and it shall spread and triumph when its enemies are "silent in darkness." Even now it is spreading east, and west, and north, and south; it is pervading all lands; and extending its influence through all ranks. And though a black picture may be drawn of it by its calumniators,—though some men's eyes may, in consequence, see nothing in religion but darkness and gloom, men will not be blinded for ever. Let them tear away the veil that obstructs the light; let them examine the truth for themselves, and it will commend itself to their hearts. Let them come into the world where Christianity, true Christianity, operates, and they will find that it is a world of light and order; that though its disciples are still imperfect, we are nevertheless advancing; that all sects are advancing in the path of piety and truth, increasing in benevolence, in works of charity, and in happiness; and they will see reason to believe that the day will soon come, when, through the influence of the Gospel, the last remnant of darkness and misery shall have passed away. O yes; the day shall at length come, when the last tear shall be dried from man's eyes; when the last fear or doubt that agitates the guilty, or doubting, or infidel mind, shall have ceased to afflict and torment; and when every man, renewed by the reli-

\* 1 Peter i. last verses.



gion of Christ, shall know himself a child of God, and feel himself to be a friend and brother of every man in the universe; when every one shall esteem it his privilege to extend his blessings to others, and, like his Master, shall go about doing good, and shall feel, as his Master felt, that it is more blessed to give than to receive. I love the Gospel more and more, and I am persuaded that every man who, with a thoughtful and candid mind, examines it, will find it altogether lovely. Badness of heart, blindness of understanding, or corruptness of practice, may cause men to become reprobate and undiscerning, and an undiscerning mind may cause a man to be unable to see that the Gospel is good, or to relish its excellencies; but let a man give up all in his temper and conduct which is not excellent, let him abandon his evil passions and wicked habits, and inquire into the evidences of the truth for himself, and he shall know the doctrine whether it be of God; he shall have evidence that it comes from God, and experience will teach him, at the least, that it leads to God.

Mr. JONES:—

Friends,—I shall briefly notice the remarks made by Mr. Barker during his last address. He stated, at the commencement, that the stories I read to you had no connexion at all with the Christian religion. Now, my friends, bear this in mind, that in the transactions I have enumerated and laid before you, in giving you the details which I have given you, I have not mentioned any practices but those which were the result of religious conceptions. I did not connect them with the Testament; your writers in favour of persecution, of whom I have spoken, have done that for me. Therefore, if they did not belong to the Christian religion, you must blame your own Christians that gave that connection; but I do maintain that they do belong to it. Mr. Barker promises that Christianity will reform the world, and lead all men to heaven. Well, I am extremely glad that we are coming to that; it has been endeavouring to reform the world for 1839 years, but the job is to be done yet; and I wish Mr. Barker every success in his attempt to accomplish it.

But, says Mr. Barker, if you blot out religion, then there is an end of every thing that is good. My friends, we are not desirous to blot out religion. False principles, under whatever name they may exist—religious, moral, or political—should be blotted out; and it is our determination to blot them out; and however you may apprehend evil from this course, if there is anything false in that religion, it shall be struck down. It reminds me of the tale of the Roman soldier in Egypt, who determined to destroy the image the people were in the habit of worshipping. The people gathered round, and told him that if he touched the image, the sun would be darkened, all order in society would be upset, and that it would completely derange the order of nature. However the soldier went up and gave it a blow; but the sun was not blackened, the stars did not fall, it did not make the least difference. He gave it another blow, and another, until he destroyed it, when the people were surprised to find that every thing went on as before. In this way, false principles, wherever they exist in the room of true ones, must be struck down, whatever consequences may be apprehended from it.

Having answered the last argument of Mr. Barker—the sermon I have nothing to do with—I say, in summing up, you have literally fulfilled the Scripture of Matthew—"Think not that I am come to send peace upon the earth; I come not to send peace, but a sword." This, my friends, you have literally fulfilled. Peace was not brought upon the earth, but a sword; and that sword, I have told you, in the destruction of fifty millions of your fellow-creatures, you have wielded with most frightful celerity. Oh, but Mr. Barker says, the remarks in his pamphlet, relative to us being unprincipled and lustful men, were written a long time ago.

Mr. BARKER:—I did not mean the remarks in reference to you. Those are the truth, and charity rejoiceth in the truth.

Mr. JONES:—Oh, does it? I am glad to hear it, my friend. He told us that a man murdered his wife somewhere, but he did not tell us where. I gave you authority for every thing I stated; and on the other side, we have these little, gossiping tales, about the Socialists

having done this, and the infidels the other; but I pay no attention to such nonsense as that. To sum up all, as I told you, at the commencement of this debate, I look upon the majority of any society that ever existed as an honest majority. I do believe that however the world may have gone astray, they went astray upon principle, they went astray believing that they were going right, and that, whatever errors or mistakes, moral, religious, or political, may have taken place among men, causing them to differ, they have differed honestly and sincerely, wherever bodies of men were concerned. I refer to the principles of human nature; I pity the ignorance that caused the mistake, and would do my utmost, at any moment, to remove it.

In detailing the circumstances which I have detailed, in running over the instances of persecution, which I say are human mistakes, I wish not to awaken any unpleasant reminiscences; I do not wish to call up any ill feeling, or unpleasant sensation, in the mind of any individual in the room. I merely do it to refer these evils to the false principles from which they have arisen, and to remedy it, so as these mistakes may not again occur. I tell you, then, that all these mistakes are the consequences of a false conception of human nature; that your convictions are not subject to your will; but that you are forced or impelled to believe that which appears to be true, to reject that which appears to be false, and to remain in a state of doubt as to the truth or falsehood of that of which you have no positive evidence. This, then, is the manner in which the human mind works; that constitution of the human mind is the work of the Creator; and to imagine that he will punish you because you have acted in accordance with the nature he has given you, is to imagine that he will act in the most barbarous and horrible manner. I tell you, friends, in all cases you should give each other credit for sincerity in seeking after the truth; in every case, instead of persecuting, you should give each other all the assistance you can, with charity and good-will, in your efforts to discover the truth wherever it may exist. Those are the principles on which we ground the system of

which I speak,—human love and human forbearance ; for so long as you go on inflicting injury on others because they differ from you in opinion, so long you are not acting religiously, you are not acting in accordance with the will of the Creator, nor in accordance with true religion.

I have pointed out, as I told you, your mistakes ; but I do not condemn you for what you have done. I do not, I tell Mr. Barker again, and I tell you all, I do not condemn you ; I do not wish that any injury should be inflicted upon you ; but I merely bring these statements before you, that your minds may revert back to the cause of the mistakes, and do away with it. This is all ; this is the head and front of our offending ; and for this we have called down upon us the opposition and enmity of those who call themselves religious. We have no other object, but to serve you physically, intellectually, and morally, to lead you to see those mistakes which have rendered you unable to afford that assistance which human beings, in whatever country they may exist, should render to each other. All have the same wants, the same hopes, and the same necessities ; there is a human heart in every bosom ; every man is but a duplicate of every other man ; and we owe each other a mutual duty of respect, reverence, and love. Every man, being liable to go astray, should look with charity on the mistakes of others ; if we do so, whether our opinions are orthodox or heterodox, we shall do right. This is our religion : we are not the murderers that you suppose,—not the “ unprincipled and lustful men ” that we are represented to be. We grieve for the world. It is stated that Christ sweat a bloody sweat on the Mount of Calvary ; and ever since that time humanity has sweat a bloody sweat in consequence of its mistakes. Enlighten each other’s minds, love and help each other, and whatever you be, Christians, infidels, or Socialists, I believe you may hope for peace and happiness in another world. But if your conduct be as I have pictured it, whether you call yourselves Christians or not, you never can arrive at a state of bliss, unless the state of your mind fit you to enter on it. And being placed in a garden by the Creator, let us enjoy it as

much as we can ; and then we shall be better prepared to enter into the enjoyment of another. I believe too well of the Regulator of the Universe, to think that he would punish me as a man, whatever speculative mistakes I may fall into.

I thank you for your attentive hearing. I have no objection to Mr. Barker lecturing here next Saturday night, and every night for a week to come, if he chooses ; for, however he may lecture, if the truth be forwarded, my end is answered. I care not whether Christianity, or Socialism, or infidelity, or any other creed, be triumphant ; if the human family is made happy, my end will be answered.

---

Mr. CONNARD :—The last address of each of the disputants has rendered it unnecessary that I should take up time in addressing you. I will merely say, very briefly, that I admire your conduct on both evenings. I have to thank Mr. Halliwell for his impartial conduct to me and my friend, Mr. Jones ; I have also to thank Mr. Barker, for the kind manner in which he has met Mr. Jones. I hope that when you go from here, and when you have occasion to meet each other, though you may differ in opinion on many subjects, you will treat your differences in that friendly manner in which Mr. Jones and Mr. Barker have discussed this question. I wish you all good night ; and I trust that when you all meet again, or any portion of you, there will be the same brotherly affection, the same peaceful conduct manifested by all, as we have seen on this occasion.

Mr. HALLIWELL :—On behalf of the committee of Mr. Barker, and on my own behalf, I desire to return you our very sincere thanks for the kindness with which you have heard Mr. Barker. I believe that with regard to this discussion, it may be said, that each party has had perfect fair-play, and that they have met on mutual and equal terms. Mr. Barker, in his concluding speech, announced that he should give a lecture : he announced

it partly because, from the arrangements of the two nights' discussion, Mr. Jones would have one speech more than himself.

Mr. JONES:—No.

Mr. HALLIWELL:—That may be a mistake; but as Mr. Jones has adhered to the agreement, to adduce no argument in his last speech, I have advised my friend Mr. Barker that it is unnecessary, at present, for him to lecture. However, if he should think it necessary, he will announce his intention by public placard.

I think I may congratulate the friends of Mr. Barker on the subject of Mr. Barker's readiness to meet Mr. Jones, and his perfect willingness to enter into the whole argument. On that subject, nothing more need be remarked. I may also observe, that this discussion has been taken down by a short-hand writer, for the purpose of its publication; and as Mr. Jones emphatically said—"I make these statements against Christianity, that they may go the length and breadth of the land;" I emphatically say, that Christian principles will be coupled with those statements, and will also go the length and breadth of the land, and will produce an influence which I hope will not only be astonishing, but gratifying to us all. The price of the publication will be announced by public placard, and it will be issued at as early a period as possible. You will then be enabled to judge calmly on the subject, to see who has urged proper and who has urged improper arguments, when you come to read patiently, and study the matter fully. Until that time, I need not ask you to reserve your judgment; for all wise and sensible men judge after due consideration. I wish not to boast—I wish none of our friends to boast of this discussion; but I do say that there has been perfect fairplay; each has made the best of his subject; and I hope, when the publication is produced, you will all have the opportunity of judging who has had the better of the argument.

On behalf of Mr. Barker's friends I return you our sincere thanks; and would remind all parties who may have any claim on the committees, that all demands will

be paid in a day or two. I have to express my regret on one subject, that, last evening, the room was filled in such a manner that we could not accommodate all who had tickets. My friend Connard and I feel very sorry that they did not get in last night; and we should have proposed that the money should be returned them; but on counting the tickets over, we found that only 900 tickets had been received; so that a good number, 50 or 60, must have come in without their tickets being received by the door-keepers. Consequently, we are not in a position to return the money. If we are ever engaged in any future discussion, I hope this will be a lesson to us all, so that there may be no dissatisfaction on one side or the other. Having made these remarks, I will conclude by again returning you thanks, and hoping that all will be benefited by this Discussion.

Mr. JONES:—Previous to the meeting separating, as an acknowledgment that the Chairmen have done their duty impartially, I beg to propose a vote of thanks to them.

Mr. BARKER:—I beg leave to second that.

Mr. JONES:—Those who approve of it will signify their approval in the usual manner.

The resolution was then carried unanimously.

Mr. BARKER: I beg to move a vote of thanks to the Umpire, for his kindness in presiding over the present meeting.

Mr. JONES:—I beg to second that.

The motion being carried, the meeting peaceably separated.

## APPENDIX.

[By Mr. LLOYD JONES.]

MANY of the readers of the Discussion now submitted to the public will no doubt be aware of the nature of its origin; but there will also be many not acquainted therewith. I shall therefore take the liberty of stating the facts of the case,—why it took place, and the cause of delay in its publication.

About two years since a member of our society, Mr. C. J. Haslam, published a small pamphlet entitled “The Necessity of a Change,” which by some means fell into the hands of Joseph Barker, who, considering himself a giant in the cause of Christianity, and having a desire, it might be, to make himself popular, wrote a letter to the Editor of the “New Moral World,” in which he stated that Mr. Haslam, in his pamphlet, had charged the Christian religion with producing all the misery and crime that afflict our country. In reply to this, Mr. Haslam published a tract called “The Evils of Private Property, being an Answer to a Letter by the Rev. Joseph Barker,” in which I find the following passage:—

“You must, sir, have a wonderfully deep and vigorous understanding. I challenge you to point out a single passage in the ‘Necessity of a Change,’ in which such a statement is made, or where even the shadow of such an inference can be drawn. You say that it is insinuated in my pamphlet from beginning to end. Without any disrespect, sir, and without any impropriety of feeling, I flatly deny it. It is a foul calumny.”

The reverend gentleman being thus detected in a *faux pas*, became silent, and no more was heard of him, until September 1st, when a No. of his “Evangelical



Reformer" made its appearance, containing an article headed "The Socialists," in which he reiterates a challenge which had been previously given to, and declined by, Mr. Haslam, accompanying such reiteration with the following language :

"They (the Socialists) are an ill-designing and unprincipled set of men;" and "they are persons that are governed by selfishness, by passion, and by lust." "They are such as have resisted truth till they are given over to a reprobate mind."

When this most scurrilous article had made its appearance, it was considered that some means should be adopted to put a stop to a man's proceedings, who it appeared had set at naught both truth and decency. The Secretary of the Salford District Committee was instructed to write to him to know what arrangements he would wish to have made for a Discussion, and also to inform him that I was appointed to meet him. This led to a long correspondence between Mr. Barker and myself, during which he manifested every desire to wriggle out of the matter,\* and succeeded for a time; but our friends in Oldham shortly afterwards issued a placard which so pointedly charged him with a want of truth and courage, that he was forced to come forward, and accordingly arrangements were made in the presence of a number of the friends of both parties for holding a discussion.†

It will be observed by a reference to the question, that it contains two propositions; the first of which is founded on the old calumny which had been so often denied, and which Mr. Barker had never attempted to establish, although he was the originator of it.‡ Mr. Barker seemed determined to fight this man "in buckram," and on no other condition would he come to a discussion; I

\* All who have read the correspondence as published in No. 11 to 20 of the "Evangelical Reformer," and noticed his long and dishonest remarks, especially on my last letter, which he has chopped up to destroy its effect, cannot fail to recognize the sly hand of the cunning Priest.

† For question and conditions see page 4 of the Report.

‡ I have repeatedly, both in public and in private, taunted Mr. B. with this calumny, and although he has gone on writing, he has never attempted to give the passage containing it.—L. J.

therefore allowed it to stand, knowing that he could gain nothing by it but an exposure of his trickery and deceit. The discussion of the second proposition occupied the two nights of February 19th and 20th; and I think I may safely say that there were not two opinions as to the signal failure of Joseph Barker.

Here, then, was a discussion undertaken in consequence of the most unfair attacks, ending in the complete overthrow of the aggressor. What, then, was he to do to prevent himself from sinking? There was nothing which he could do but take advantage of his right to correct the press, and he did this so effectually, that it is impossible to tell the original, it is so bedaubed with the *honest* man's *after thoughts*.

When I saw the havoc he was making of the Reporter's manuscript, I objected to it. I told him repeatedly, in the presence of Mr. Halliwell, his Chairman, that if the Reporter had omitted any argument which he had used, or had left any sentence unfinished, as will sometimes happen, he should have every liberty to add the one and mend the other; in fact, that I would allow him anything fair and honorable; but that I could not submit to a total re-writing of the speeches, in which the original was almost entirely lost in the mass that was superadded.

The press was therefore stopped. Mr. Barker then, through the medium of his "Evangelical Reformer," told the public that I objected to his *correcting* his speeches; he also went to the Reporter, and procured a note which stated that the liberty he took was allowable on such occasions;\* and likewise said that I had sent him to the Reporter for such opinion, and that nevertheless I would not allow the printing to go on. Having no other way of meeting the attack which Mr. Barker was weekly making upon me, through his little paper, I placarded the town of Oldham, where the discussion took place. In this placard I gave the facts of the case, so far as they had transpired, with a specimen of his corrections. It

\* Those who perceive the nature of the additions, as I have pointed them out, must decide this question.—L. J.

was a passage from one of his speeches, which in the Reporter's manuscript consisted of 104 words, but in Mr. Barker's CORRECTED manuscript was swelled out into 271—being an addition of 167 words. I denied, also, that I had sent him to the Reporter for an opinion. He re-asserted that I had done so, and said I did so in the presence of Geo. Cave, the printer. Believing Mr. Cave to be a man who would not lend himself to serve the base purpose of Mr. Barker, I went to him, and asked him if he had any recollection of such an affair, and from him received the following note :—

“I certainly have no recollection of Mr. Lloyd Jones ever referring Mr. Barker to the Reporter, for an opinion, in my presence.  
GEO. CAVE.”

So much, then, for Mr. Barker's statements. But to go through all the falsehoods and misrepresentations of Mr. B., would take me more time than I am willing to bestow on such an unworthy subject.

It must be recollected that all this dispute was about Mr. B.'s speeches of the first night, and during its continuance he held in his possession the Reporter's manuscript of the second night, and would not allow me to look at it. I called at the printers' repeatedly for it, but to no purpose; the answer invariably was, that Mr. Barker had not yet returned it. At last I called upon Mr. Halliwell, his Chairman, to know what Mr. B. intended to do. Mr. Halliwell expressed a desire to have the thing amicably arranged, and told me he had expected Mr. B. would come to town that morning, but that he had just received a note excusing his attendance, which he would read for me. Upon this he drew from his pocket the note, and read it; and while he was doing so, I, seeing my name mentioned in the postscript, took the liberty of looking over it, and read as follows :—

“I wish you would call at Cave and Sever's, and at the Reporter's, and caution them against letting Lloyd Jones have the manuscript.”

When Mr. Halliwell had finished reading Mr. B.'s excuse for not coming, he folded up the note to return it to his pocket, I then said to him—“What is that about

me?" "Oh, nothing," said he; "it is only a little private communication." "But," I replied, "*I have read it*; and I ask you as a man, have you been to do what it recommends?" "No," said he, "I pledge you my honor as a man, I have not been, neither do I intend to go."

Here, then, was an evident design upon the part of Mr. B. to use this secret and dishonest means to prevent me from seeing the manuscript which he held in his possession for seven weeks; could there be stronger evidence of his unfairness?

The reverend gentleman then made a proposal for each one to be left to publish his own side, or if I thought proper, entirely to suppress the Report; neither of which I would agree to, and was at last (that the public might have the Report) forced to allow of all his alterations and additions.

Having yielded the above point rather than disappoint the public, I determined to take the best means at my disposal, to give to them as clear a view of the matter as possible, so that they might be fully aware as to which of the two was instrumental in causing the delay of the publication. Mr. Barker said, in one of his "Reformers," that I "was ashamed to let my speeches appear in print, as they would not, there, have a confident look and a clenched fist to set them off;"—and this, too, he had the boldness to say, when I was standing out for the Report as the Reporter had furnished it, and when the only point in dispute was as to whether he should re-write his speeches and make the monstrous alterations which he insisted on making! To prove, then, that I was not ashamed of my speeches, and that I threw no bar in the way of publication, but that Mr. Barker really was ashamed of his speeches, I shall merely state, that there are not twenty words *altered* in my speeches, and not a single word *added*; while Mr. Barker has made so many alterations, that it is totally impossible to point them out; his speeches are like the old gentleman's cotton stockings, that were so darned with worsted, that it was a puzzle to tell whether they were originally worsted or cotton. And as to additions, I have gone to the trouble of counting the words as they stand in the Reporter's manuscript, and as

they have been added to in the printed speeches; and I find the account stands thus between the Reporter and Mr. Barker, for the first night alone:—

	Words.
Mr. B.'s first speech, as given by the Reporter, contains...	2000
To which Mr. B. has added .....	1403
Making a total of.....	3403
Mr. B.'s second speech, as given by the Reporter .....	1946
To which Mr. B. has added .....	1559
Making a total of.....	3505
Mr. B.'s third speech, as given by the Reporter.....	2227
To which Mr. B. has added.....	1577
Making a total of.....	3804
Mr. B.'s fourth and last speech, as given by the Reporter, short speech on both sides .....	824
To which Mr. Barker has added.....	1283
Making a total of.....	2107
Total of words for the whole night, as given by the Reporter	6997
Total added by Mr. Barker.....	5822
Total.....	12819

which, as will be perceived, is nearly double the original number of words, and yet Mr. Barker, "heaven save the mark," calls himself HONEST!

But we have not done with Mr. B. yet. When I was in Sheffield discussing with Mr. Pallister, I was charged with keeping back the Report of the Discussion, whereupon I stated to the meeting that the only cause of delay was, that Mr. B. had insisted upon *re-writing* his speeches, and that I was not prepared to allow it. This statement was communicated to Mr. Barker by some one of his Sheffield friends, upon which he wrote to the "Sheffield Independent" a most shamefully false letter, in which, after stating that it was agreed by the Committee that each disputant should correct his own speeches so as to bring them as near as possible to the state in which they were delivered," he goes on to say—

"This, both Lloyd Jones and I did; and Lloyd Jones made *five times more* alterations in his speeches as reported (or what amounts to the same thing, *got the Reporter to make them*) than I did in mine. I, however, made no objection."

Made no objection! "Good easy man." How unfortunate it is for Mr. Barker that he should introduce a third party, as, whenever he introduces a *respectable* witness, I always catch him "fibbing." I sent the paper containing this letter to the Reporter, and received from him the following note:—

"39, Greek-street, Chorlton-on-Medlock,  
Manchester, 23rd July, 1839.

"SIR,—I have read with some surprise a statement in Mr. Barker's letter, published in a Sheffield paper, four months since, but which I had not before seen, to the effect that you "got the Reporter to make alterations" in your speeches. What alterations you and Mr. Barker might make after the manuscript left my hands, I have nothing to do with; but in justice to myself, I must deny having made any, previous to that, by the suggestion of either side; indeed, I never exchanged a word with you, or any one else, on the subject till after the completion of the manuscript. One other expression of Mr. B.'s, as he has introduced my name into his letter, I must protest against. He says, "Where sentences had been half-reported," &c. There were none such: but this is a matter of little importance, as no one who knows me will believe it.—I am, Sir, yours obediently,

J. DAVISON."

"To Mr. L. Jones."

In the same letter that contains the above outrage upon truth, Mr. Barker further says—

"Lloyd Jones, however, objected to my alterations, and set them aside, and made a few corrections himself instead, and so got my first speech and part of another set up, corrected by him."

I appeal to the printers as to the correctness of this statement. They know it is utterly false, so does Mr. Barker himself; and I cannot help feeling the most unfeigned pity for the man who has been forced to resort to such meanness.

In reading over my speeches, the public should be aware that I have neither added to, nor diminished from, them. There are many things in them which, no doubt, might be better said, and which, if I had availed myself of the unwarrantable liberty taken by Mr. B., would have read much better; but "what I have said

I've said;" and I wish not to substitute any thing else for it. I have not even given my historical references; knowing that the man who had calumniated me without any ground whatever, would, if I had given the least opportunity, have made a great deal of it. In argument and illustration I might, if I thought this the proper place, add much. In short, I did not during the two nights say half of that which I intended to say, especially on the last night; but the time being past, I consider this no fair place to re-commence the discussion.

I see nothing at all in Mr. Barker's speeches but such matter as we generally meet with in the common run of Methodist sermons, and I can only say of them, as the mathematician said of Thomson's "Seasons," "They are very fine, but they prove nothing." Mr. B.'s continual cry was, that the atrocities which I enumerated were not to be found in the New Testament; and the attempt of his Chairman to stop me on the second night deserves a passing notice. It should be remembered that "the influence of Christianity" was the subject; and that "nothing should be taken for Christianity but the system of Christ as laid down in the New Testament," was one of the conditions. Now all who read the Discussion cannot fail to observe that I took the doctrine of Christ as a groundwork from the New Testament, as found in Mark xvi. from verse 14 to the end of the chapter, and traced the influence of that doctrine in the history of the Christian church; and in doing so, any man who is not blinded either by prejudice or ignorance, must observe that I had not departed from the question.

I must also, in justice to the people of Oldham, observe that although I have travelled much in this part of the country, and contended much on the unpopular side of public questions, I have never met the same candid and honourable treatment which I did at the hands of the Oldham people.

LLOYD JONES.

*Salford, August 12th, 1839.*

[By the Rev. J. BARKER.]

*Remarks on LLOYD JONES's Appendix.*

LLOYD JONES has frequently endeavoured to turn the minds of the public from the great point in dispute, namely, the influence of true Christianity, and to turn the discussion into a personal quarrel. I have carefully refused to follow him in this useless course of proceeding. My desire has always been to keep the attention of the public to the one great question, the influence of Christianity, and from this one point I hope the readers of this Report will not allow their attention to be diverted. The question in dispute is—not whether I have acted fairly in the discussion, but whether the practice of genuine Christianity, as taught in the New Testament, tends to produce good or evil. This is the question. Suppose all Lloyd Jones says against me to be true, it amounts to nothing; I am not Christianity. I do not care much whether you take my character from Lloyd Jones or from those that know me better, and that are less partial judges; but do not let Lloyd Jones succeed in his endeavours to turn your attention from the proper subject to myself.

But my readers must not suppose that I plead guilty to Lloyd Jones's charges. There is not one of them which is not wholly false, as the friends who are acquainted with the history of this discussion well know. To correct all Lloyd Jones's mis-statements would take up too much room; it would leave me no space for the great question under discussion. I shall therefore say little in my own defence; that I may be the more at liberty to say something on the proper question.

Lloyd Jones's principal endeavour is to persuade the public that I have acted unfairly in correcting the report of my speeches. A few words may put this matter in a proper light.

1. It is true that I *re-wrote* my *first* night's speeches ;



but it is not true that I wrote *new* speeches. And what would it matter if I had written them ten times over, so long as I made no unfair alterations in them? My reason for re-writing the speeches was to save trouble to the printers and myself: I found it difficult to make the necessary corrections on the Reporter's small slips of paper without rendering some passages illegible. The second night's speeches I did not re-write at all, as Lloyd Jones knows.

2. What Lloyd Jones says about me adding to my speeches, and altering them, is partly true and partly false, but all deceitful.

1. It is not true that I have altered the sense of any passage in my speeches. When Lloyd Jones objected to my corrections, I got the Reporter to examine them at Lloyd Jones's request; and when he had done so, he wrote me the following note for Lloyd Jones's satisfaction:—

“Pool-fold, Thursday afternoon.

“Sir,—At Mr. Barker's request, I have carefully revised his re-written manuscript, and, although considerable alteration is made in the *expression* and *structure* of several sentences, I cannot find that he has introduced any new fact or argument. The liberty he has taken appears to be *within* the limits of what is usually allowed on such occasions: of course I suppose you have the same privilege.

“Yours obediently,

“J. DAVISON,” (*Reporter.*)

I may add, that after this I blotted out many of my corrections, the most important part of them in fact, to induce Lloyd Jones to allow the printers to proceed. So far from exceeding my right, I gave up a great part of it, to prevent the public from being deprived of the report of the discussion.

2. But have I added as many words as Lloyd Jones says I have? Let any one count the words in the Reporter's copy, and read the speeches as printed in this publication, and they will see for themselves that I have done no such thing. Again, I speak almost twice as fast as Lloyd Jones, as those who have heard us both speak are aware. If then I have nearly doubled the size

of my speeches, they will be at least three times as long in print as Lloyd Jones's. Just count the pages, and see how they stand. Mine will be found on an average to be only about one third larger than his. With any one acquainted with the two speakers, this will be proof sufficient, that instead of doubling the size of my speeches, I have not given them in full.

3. I have only added one passage to the Reporter's copy in all the speeches; and that *that* passage had been delivered by me and omitted by the Reporter, is proved by the fact, that Lloyd Jones had answered it in his following speech. It was not till I found that Lloyd Jones had answered the passage, that I recollected having delivered it.

4. If there be another passage added, let Lloyd Jones point it out. If there be a passage in which I have altered the sense, let Lloyd Jones point it out.

5. But why did I add any words at all? I answer, to do justice to the public and to the subject. In some cases, the beginning of a sentence was left out in the Report, in others the end. Sometimes the first part of an argument was given, and the latter part omitted. My historical quotations were reported so incorrectly, that the sense was lost or perverted; and in other cases, just about one half, or hardly one half, of the quotations was given. Now Lloyd Jones gave the books out of which he read the chief part of his speeches to the Reporter, and the Reporter transcribed the passages as Lloyd Jones had marked them. But I did not give my books to the Reporter, supposing that he had taken all down. If the Reporter had not corrected his report of Lloyd Jones's speeches by the books Lloyd Jones put into his hands, Lloyd Jones would have had to add *three* words or more where I have added *one*. This is what I mean by the Reporter correcting Lloyd Jones's speeches, and that it was thus done, both the Reporter and Lloyd Jones know and will acknowledge. But as I had not got the Reporter to correct and supply my quotations, I did it myself, and that I did it fairly, and kept within the limits usually allowed on such occasions, the Reporter's own note as given above will testify.

I will just give a sample of the imperfect manner in which my speeches were reported, and of the necessity of some corrections. I read over in one of my speeches the following passage, viz. "I have read the objections of Porphyry, of Celsus, of Julian, of Hobbes, of Toland, of Tindal, of Blount, of Woolston, of Hume, of Gibbon, of Burdon, of Paine, of Voltaire, of Rousseau, of Diderot, of Helvetius, of Carlile, of Taylor, of Owen, of Lloyd Jones, and of Haslam, and they are all alike. Arguments there are none, but false accusations, bold and extravagant statements, without truth or foundation, there are in abundance." In this passage there are twenty-one names, nine of which the Reporter had omitted, together with about one half of the other words in the sentence. I could fill many pages with instances of similar omissions and imperfections in the Report, which Lloyd Jones himself could not dispute; and what could I do in such cases, but as I have, partially, done,—correct the Report, and restore my speeches in some measure to the state in which they were delivered? It is true, that in their most imperfect form my speeches contained a sufficient answer to Lloyd Jones's speeches; still I felt desirous of doing the subject justice. I did not, however, think it proper to add new arguments, or write new speeches; if I had done that, I might have made my speeches ten times as long as they are.

But "G. Cave does not recollect hearing Lloyd Jones refer me to the Reporter." I answer, I never said G. Cave did recollect any such thing. It is possible G. Cave did not hear Lloyd Jones refer me to the Reporter, and it is very possible that he might hear it and forget. That Lloyd Jones *did* refer the matter to the Reporter, is nevertheless true; and it is also true that any reasonable man would have been content with the Reporter's decision.

As to the account which Lloyd Jones has given in his Appendix, of the origin and history of the Discussion, I can only say that it is not true, as those who are acquainted with the facts of the case will perceive. 1. It was not I that was the aggressor, but the Socialists. 2. It

was C. J. Haslam that first wrote a letter in the "New Moral World," and not I, as Lloyd Jones insinuates. The first letter I wrote was in answer to C. J. Haslam.

3. As to what Lloyd Jones says about my desire to make myself popular, &c. they are charges that I cannot answer; but one may reasonably ask how Lloyd Jones becomes acquainted with men's motives? Would he have people to believe that he can read the secrets of men's hearts?

As to whether Lloyd Jones has "overthrown" me, I suppose the public will wish to judge for themselves on that point. But if Lloyd Jones thinks he has "overthrown" *me*, he surely will not so far imitate the folly of his favourite Voltaire, as to imagine that he has overthrown Christianity also. If I have not triumphed in the debate, the fault is certainly in me, and not in the cause I had in hand.

I am glad there is one point in which I can agree with Lloyd Jones, viz. the good behaviour of the people who attended the Discussion. They did indeed conduct themselves in a very honourable manner. I the more cheerfully subscribe to Lloyd Jones's statement on this subject, because the principal part of the persons present were professed disciples of that religion which Lloyd Jones so bitterly assailed as the great cause of all intolerance. The patience, the candour, and the forbearance of the people, did of themselves furnish a sufficient refutation of Lloyd Jones's calumnies. Lloyd Jones could not have found such a number of patient, candid, and tolerant men under the whole heavens, except in a country where the Christian religion, to some extent, prevails; so plain it is, that the only true and efficient friend of freedom is the religion of Jesus Christ. I honour the people of Oldham and the neighbourhood, and I have no doubt but four-fifths of all that attended the Discussion will agree with me, that they learned the exemplary meekness and forbearance which they exhibited on that occasion, from the lessons and examples of the Christian system.

I know nothing further that needs to be added in answer to Lloyd Jones's Appendix. The full history of what

Lloyd Jones has done to prevent or to delay the appearance of the Report of the Discussion, together with a full answer to any foolish slanders he has thrown out against me, &c. &c. may be found in my Evangelical Reformer. Those who wish to ascertain the truth on those personal matters, may do so by reading that periodical, or the articles ranged under the head "Socialism," in the index of that work: those who care nothing about such matters may do as they please.

I may just add, that to prevent delay in the publication of the Report, I offered to Lloyd Jones any of the following conditions:—

1. Either for each disputant to correct his own speeches, without interfering with the speeches of the other; or

2. For the speeches on both sides to be published just as they were taken down by the Reporter, without the addition or alteration of a single word on either side; or,

3. For the whole to be referred to a committee, consisting of equal numbers of men chosen from both sides; or,

4. To refer it to the Reporter and leave him to decide; or,

5. To let the Report be dropped altogether; or,

6. To let us discuss the matter over again, allowing more time for the discussion, and each one to have his own Reporter.

To none of those proposals would Lloyd Jones agree. What I could have proposed more, I cannot tell, unless it had been for Lloyd Jones to correct both my speeches and his own, and to write my appendix for me also. This certainly appears to have been his wish from the beginning, and it is because I could not agree to such a plan that the Report has been so long delayed, and that Lloyd Jones labours so mightily to fix some stain upon my character. Poor man, I wish him a better state of mind. But he should not expect to have all his own way in a world like this. Neither Socialist nor Christian can have everything as he could like here. However things may go on in the Socialists' New World, the man is sure to be disap-

pointed who expects to be the universal Dictator and Judge in the Old World.

I would advise Lloyd Jones to moderate his hopes and fancies a little, if he wishes to pass through life without disappointment. In short, I would advise him to read his New Testament, and to attend to that teacher which sometimes at least, I should hope, whispers instruction to his soul in secret. I wish him well; I would not willingly injure him for all the world. I freely forgive him every thing that he has said or done of an unfriendly nature towards me. He is a man of considerable powers in his way; I am sorry he should not employ his powers in a better cause. It grieves me to the heart to see a man whom God has qualified for usefulness, exerting his talents in the cause of a godless, hopeless, lawless system of infidelity. My worst wish is that he may see his error, and enjoy with me and many thousands of others of his happier countrymen, the pleasures and delights of genuine piety, and the bright and gladdening hopes of a Christian's immortality.

I now proceed to the proper business of the Appendix, which is to lay such additional matters before our readers, as may assist them in forming their opinions as to the merits of the question. In reading over my speeches the public should be aware, that I corrected the first night's speeches so as to make them as much like what they were when delivered as possible, and that the reason why all the speeches are not what they should be is, that Lloyd Jones made so many objections, that I blotted out a great part of my corrections of the first night's speeches, and did very little at the second night's speeches.

---

#### *Observations on LLOYD JONES's last Speech.*

Lloyd Jones tells us, page 123, that in the details of persecution which he has given, he has mentioned no practices but such as were the result of religious conceptions. He should have said *irreligious* conceptions. He has from first to last passed over those practices which

were the natural results of Christian truth and feeling, and picked up, from the history of eighteen hundred years, all the misdeeds of inconsistent and faithless pretenders to Christianity. If the persecutions he has mentioned do not belong to Christianity, we must blame our Christians, he says, that have given the connexion. Our Christians have *not* attributed those persecutions to Christianity; they have invariably attributed them to the *want* of Christianity. Why will Lloyd Jones thus shamelessly utter those falsehoods?

On page 124, Lloyd Jones gives us a story about a Roman soldier and an Egyptian image: where he got this fable, or whether he has made it himself, I know not, but it does not fit the subject in hand. For, 1. Christianity is not a lifeless image; it is a principle of mighty operation. It has already, as I have shown in this discussion, shaken and thrown down many of the strongholds of sin and misery, and given birth to benevolent and godlike institutions innumerable, which are filling the earth with every kind of blessings. At this moment, while Lloyd Jones is indulging his unseemly ridicule, it is shaking the nations, and diffusing through the earth a spirit of purity and truth and benevolence, unfelt before. 2. The soldier is not yet born that has knocked down Christianity. Many soldiers we have had, daring and guilty enough to strike at it, but we have had none strong enough to knock it down;—none have been so successful as the Roman soldier was with his Egyptian image. We have had Voltaire, and Rousseau, and Gibbon, and Paine, and R. Owen, all mighty men in the ranks of infidelity, and all aiming at it, not two or three, but many thousands of blows;—we have had the infidel philosophers of old, Julian, Porphyry, Celsus, and others, together with the persecuting emperors of Rome, and the bloody enemies of other lands, aiming at Christianity their heavy blows;—and now we have Lloyd Jones exerting all his powers to knock it down, but still it will not fall. Neither the swords of soldiers bathed in the blood of Christian martyrs, nor the clubs of infidels, aimed at the Christian system, have been able

to make Christianity flinch or tremble for a moment. Former generations of soldiers and infidels have passed away one after another, leaving their swords of cruelty and their clubs of falsehood to others, and those other generations of infidels have spent their strength and craft in trying to bring the system of the Saviour down, but still it stands, unmoved and unmovable. It has witnessed the death and burial of a hundred generations of its enemies, but it still lives. And when Lloyd Jones and his party have done their utmost, they will only succeed in knocking down themselves;—Christianity will still maintain its ground.

Lloyd Jones says, page 124, that “false principles must be struck down.” So say we. False principles will be struck down: the number of infidel systems already thrown down by the power of the Gospel, gives us assurance that infidel Socialism, and every similar system of falsehood, must be quickly thrown down also.

On page 124, Lloyd Jones quoted a passage from Matt. x. 34—“Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.” I can scarcely believe but that Lloyd Jones, when he was commenting on this passage, knew that he was perverting the words of Christ, and giving them a meaning quite different from their true meaning; a meaning which they were never intended to have, and which no honest and understanding man ever could give them. He insinuated that in this passage Christ meant to exhort his disciples to use the sword in propagating his religion; and he added, that his disciples had followed his advice in this sense faithfully. Whoever wishes to know the meaning of this passage, if he will look at it, and observe the connexion in which it stands, will see that its meaning is the opposite of what Lloyd Jones insinuates. Christ has been warning his disciples that they would have to meet with persecution while preaching the Gospel, and then he repeats the passage referred to; as much as to say, Think not that this Gospel, peaceable as it is itself, will always be peacefully received. However true and excellent a system may be, some will reject it, and they will persecute those who embrace



it. The results of my visit to this earth, therefore, will not be all peace. The son will be set against the father, and the daughter against the mother. He therefore that will be my disciple must prepare for trials and persecutions, for he will be sure to meet with them; he must be willing to lose the friendship of his relations and friends, and to see members of his own family become his foes. This was Christ's meaning. He was not telling his disciples to persecute others, he was foretelling his disciples that others would persecute them.

In this sense, we acknowledge that Christ brought a sword or divisions upon earth, and we see not how this can furnish any rational objection to Christianity. Every one who introduces any useful reforms into society, must cause divisions in the same way. All will not approve the new doctrine at once, and those who do not approve, will often oppose those who do approve of it. This was the case with the bills for abolishing the slave trade and slavery, and with every other good measure. The persons that introduced and passed those good measures, had an eye to the peace and happiness of their country and of their kind, and these measures were adapted to promote those desirable ends; still, for the time, they were the occasion of divisions and conflicts. If one should introduce a measure to do away with drunkenness, it would be the occasion of similar evils. The better the law, the greater and fiercer would be the opposition from those who live by drunkenness. But would the opposition and persecutions of beer-sellers and spirit-sellers prove the law to be a bad one? Would any honest man say, that the law against drunkenness encouraged or inculcated persecution?

These words of Christ may be illustrated by a passage in Williams's "Missionary Enterprise in the South Sea Islands." "It is a remarkable fact," says J. Williams, page 184, "that in no island of any importance has Christianity been introduced without a war; but it is right to observe," adds he, "that in every instance the heathens, not the Christians, have been the aggressors." But what sort of conduct is it in Lloyd

Jones, a man who professes to belong to a new order of beings, wiser than all that have gone before, to blame Christians for all the injuries that infidels and wicked people choose to do them?

Even Socialism causes divisions in families. It has already set the father against the son, and the mother against the daughter. Wives are sorrowing over their Social husbands, and parents over their children, and the peace of many families is broken. Lloyd Jones knows it is so; and how does he account for it? Does he blame Socialism? Oh no; it is the enemies of Socialism that make the mischief, he will tell you, by their opposition to it. If they would all be Socialists, there would be no disputes or separations. Lloyd Jones says that the introduction of their system has excited persecution in some places; but does Lloyd Jones blame Socialism for those persecutions? Oh no; he will tell you at once that it is the persecutors, the enemies of the Social system, that are to blame, and not the persons who are persecuted. How is it that Lloyd Jones judges so differently when his own system is concerned, from what he does when Christianity is concerned? Does it look like honesty? If Socialists can run the risk of disturbing society, in order to introduce a system that robs men of God, of trust in Providence, and of all hopes of future happiness,—a system that degrades man to a lawless brute, and a mere machine; surely Christianity cannot be to blame for risking persecution, when it comes to man laden with all the blessings of time, and with all the hopes and joys of the immortal life to come.

I would observe, therefore, in conclusion, 1. That Christ did not put a sword into the hands of his disciples; he forbade the use of swords, and commanded his disciples to use no weapons but truth and charity, and they did as he commanded them. 2. That the persecutions which arose about Christianity, were chargeable, not upon Christianity, but upon the enemies of Christianity. Christians were *persecuted*, it was the enemies of Christianity that were the persecutors. 3. If any have persecuted in the name of Christ, they were wolves in sheep's clothing;

men that either did not understand Christianity, or that, like Voltaire, Hobbes, and some Socialists, pretended to be Christians for their own unworthy ends. 4. Enlightened and honest Christians never persecute. Christianity is opposed to persecution from first to last.

Another passage like the former, which the Socialists pervert, is Luke xiv. 26:—"If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." "Here we are required," say the Socialists, "to hate our nearest kindred." We observe—1. That to *hate*, in Scripture language, does not always mean the opposite of kindness and good will; it frequently means no more than a less degree of love or esteem. This is the meaning of this word in this passage. Hence this passage, as given by Matthew, reads thus:—"He that loveth father or mother more than me, is unworthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me," &c. (Matt. x. 37.) We observe—2. That any honest man who will read the whole chapter, will see that no such thing as unkindness or ill-will is required of Christians. Great multitudes, struck with the excellency of Christ's doctrine, and the evident divinity of his miracles, were preparing to follow him. Christ, who knew that if they followed him they must be persecuted and deserted by their relations, foretells to them what they must expect to suffer if they would be his faithful followers. "Ye shall be hated of all men," says he, "for my name's sake; and they will deliver you up to the councils, and scourge you in their synagogues; and the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child; and the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death." And then he proceeds to tell them, that if they would be true to him, they must prepare to lose all things for his sake. "You must prepare to forfeit the esteem and affection of mother and father, of wife and child, and to sacrifice even life itself." And then he adds the words of the passage—"He that loveth father or mother, &c. more than me, cannot be my disciple." This was all plain, and it was

all true; and the event of a few years proved it true. And it is a proof that Christ's religion must have had a deep and firm foundation in the convictions and affections of his disciples, or they could never have stood true to it in the midst of such trials. They must have had different proofs of the truth of Christianity from what its enemies have to offer for the truth of Infidelity.

On page 124, Lloyd Jones calls what I said about the conduct of some of the leading men of his party, "little gossiping tales without authority." If he wishes for authority, it is at hand. The person who deserted his wife and child, and seduced his wife's sister, and when she was pregnant abandoned her, was ———, the Editor of the ———, the Socialist newspaper, and one of the first men in Lloyd Jones's community.\* Any that want to see other cases of infidel Social profligacy, may see them in my pamphlet entitled "The Overthrow of Infidel Socialism." The case of ——— was published in a pamphlet by George Reece of Manchester. I have the pamphlet by me. This pamphlet the Socialists have never answered. Instead of answering it, they went round to the booksellers, and threatened them with a prosecution if they did not desist from selling it, and in this way those boasters of liberty and free discussion, those professed enemies of persecution, suppressed the pamphlet.

Lloyd Jones tells us, page 125, that all the evils which he has enumerated are the result of "a false conception of human nature." It is Lloyd Jones's conceptions on this subject that happen to be false. The persecutions Lloyd Jones has detailed had no more to do with any "false conception of human nature," than had the "physical, intellectual, and moral hospitals" of Owenism. The persecutions he has named had nothing to do with any "conceptions of human nature," either false or

\* I gave the name to the printers, but they refused to insert it, from a disinclination to incur the risk of a prosecution; I have the name in my possession, together with the names of a great number of leading Socialists, who have acted in a similar way.

true; they originated in that love of power or wealth, or in those instincts of man's animal nature, which nothing but the religion of Christ can subdue or destroy. The spirit of persecution is natural to man, in his unconverted state, just as persecution and blood are natural to wolves and tigers. Men in their natural state have always been persecutors. The ancient Greeks and Romans were persecutors; the ancient Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Persians were persecutors; the Chinese are persecutors; the unconverted savages of the South Sea Islands, the wandering tribes of Africa, the savages of America, the Greenlanders, and the Esquimaux of Labrador, are all persecutors. All men are persecutors in their natural state, even to Robert Owen himself, who would have every Social community a standing army, and all the armed communities to unite, by the terror and the force of arms, to oblige the religious part of the human family to give up their religion and embrace the system of infidel Socialism.\*

"A misconception of human nature," indeed! Whatever misconceptions of human nature a man may have, he cannot persecute, if he be a genuine Christian; and however correct a man's conceptions of human nature may be, he will still be a persecutor, when tempted to be so, unless brought under the influence of true religion. But if, indeed, false conceptions of human nature did give rise to persecution, true Christians could not persecute; for the Christian religion is built upon the truest conceptions of human nature. The true Christian's conceptions of human nature are as correct as the Socialists' conceptions of human nature are erroneous.

Lloyd Jones would have us to believe that whenever people persecute, it is because they think that people can change their opinions at pleasure. But if Lloyd Jones thinks so, he is under a great mistake. Persons may persecute on any principles. A man in my neighbourhood was a Socialist. He believed that men could not help their belief, and that they were not therefore answerable for their belief. Yet this man persecuted his wife

\* See his *Essay on the Formation of Character*, p. 47, 48.

and children, and forced them to give up going to the chapel and the Sunday school. Here was a Socialist persecutor: did he persecute because he thought that his wife and children were answerable for their belief? How could he? He thought people were the creatures of circumstances. He persecuted, because he thought Sunday schools and chapels were bad "*circumstances*;" and he would beat them and turn them out of doors rather than let them be surrounded with such circumstances. Beadle, of America, who held Lloyd Jones's notions about human nature, and who was as free from what Lloyd Jones calls "false conceptions of human nature," as Lloyd Jones himself, nevertheless murdered all his children and his wife in one night, and then murdered himself. The doctrine of "*circumstances*," of which the Socialists boast so much, is not only capable of being abused to purposes of persecution, but its natural tendency is to prepare the way for persecution. This is plain from the case of Diderot, the father of Owen's system; who, though he contends that no one deserves blame, whatever his character be, yet contends that evil doers ought to be executed, to furnish motives or circumstances to prevent others from doing wrong. Hence also those moral and intellectual hospitals recommended by Robert Owen, and the utility of his doctrine of having all the communities armed, that by such circumstances (*viz.* the force and terror of their arms) they might oblige to become infidel Socialists.

So with the founders of the Inquisition, and with all the great persecutors of all ages; all acted on Robert Owen's doctrine of the influence of circumstances. They professed, just as Robert Owen does, in reference to his dungeon hospitals and armed communities, to have the good of the people at heart, and they professed to put people under the influence of their newly arranged circumstances, for this very end, to do them good. They had no idea that people could believe error at pleasure; their object was, by circumstances of terror, to change their faith for them, just as it is with Robert Owen; or else to make them keep their belief to themselves, that others

might not be misled by them. In short, there is nothing can properly keep men from persecuting but the religion of Jesus Christ: this, and this only, is the effectual and thorough cure for the spirit of bigotry and persecution; but this is adapted, as it spreads, to do away with all persecutions, whether superstitious, political, or infidel persecutions.

On page 125, Lloyd Jones tells us that our "convictions are not subject to our wills;" this is not true. Thousands believe error at this moment, and all because they will not search after truth. When information and evidence are placed in a man's reach, he can either attend to that information and examine that evidence, or neglect it and turn from it, just as he wills or pleases; and so his convictions depend on his will. When I heard of teetotalism I thought it would be a good system, if it were practicable, but I thought it impracticable. But in order to be certain, I tried it, and found it practicable enough. By choosing to try and examine, I changed my belief. So with Christianity: "if a man will do God's will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men prefer darkness to light, because their deeds are evil."

He says "we are forced to believe what appears to be true," &c. Whoever doubted it? But a man can make falsehood appear to be truth, and truth appear to be falsehood. A man by lewdness may so deprave his soul, that the Christian doctrine of marriage shall appear to be false, and R. Owen's unclean doctrine true; and another, by a chaste conduct, can make the doctrine of Christ appear to be true, and R. Owen's licentious system to be false. And so in most things. A man's faith is under his own control; and this is the reason why men are answerable for their faith as well as for their conduct. But as we have shown, this doctrine of responsibility as taught in the Gospel cannot produce persecution, but just the contrary, it produces meekness and charity.

On page 125, Lloyd Jones tells us "that to imagine that God will punish men for acting in accordance with

the nature which he has given them, is to imagine that he will act in the most barbarous and horrid manner." This is perfectly true, and Christianity teaches nothing to the contrary. Christianity does not require us to act contrary to our nature; its object is to lead us to act according to our nature. All crimes against nature, Christianity condemns. But man has *two* natures, be it remembered. "Man is a compound being;" he has a body and a soul; an animal and a spiritual nature; and that for which Christianity condemns men is, acting according to the animal or carnal nature, instead of the spiritual; letting the horse ride the man, instead of the man the horse. It is Socialism that calls us to act against nature, and seeks to convert us into mere brutes. Christianity comes to make us act in accordance with our *full* nature, and so to raise human nature to perfection. Religion and uncorrupted human nature are in perfect harmony; human nature, in its perfect state, and Christianity are one. If men act according to nature rightly understood, they will be accepted of God.

An enemy is most to be dreaded when he pretends to be a friend. The devil can carry his craft no further than to transform himself into the appearance of an angel of light. And so with my opponent; his last effort of mischief is to wrap himself in pretensions of charity, and exhort us to be good and kind. Can the same fountain send forth sweet water and bitter? Shall the same mouth send forth blessing and cursing; blasphemy and Christian advice? Can a bramble bear olive berries, or a thorn figs? I am grieved with such mockery; it is more offensive than his open blasphemy. Still it is encouraging to find, that when an infidel does begin to give good advice, he is forced to go to the Gospel for it, and borrow his exhortations from the system which he persecutes. But I would rather Christianity should be preached by its friends alone. It would be more seemly in Lloyd Jones if he would first retract his unproved charges against the Gospel, and abandon his system of infidel pollution, before he turns preacher of the Gospel.

But Lloyd Jones says his only aim is the happiness of



mankind. How can he have the shamelessness to utter such pretensions, while he is labouring to overthrow the only system of unimixed purity and benevolence in the universe, and bring in a system of absolute Atheism and unrestrained licentiousness? Let them, like the Author and first preachers of Christianity, show their love to mankind by doing something for their good, by making some sacrifices for their welfare, and by setting us an example of chastity, temperance, and charity, and then let them begin to preach and make professions of charity. That you may know how to value these pretensions, read the lives of our infidels, or see their character in the "Overthrow of Infidel Socialism," "Simpson's Plea," &c.

Lloyd Jones tells us that all their offence is recommending kindness and forbearance. It would be wrong to let such false statements pass without exposure. If Lloyd Jones does not know the ground of our opposition to their system, I will briefly inform him. We oppose you, 1. Because you attempt to injure a religion which we have found by experience to be profitable unto all things; bringing with it the comforts of the life that now is, and foretastes of the life to come. 2. Because you make false charges against this religion, which you cannot prove, and will not retract. 3. Because you declare that Christian marriage, which we find one of the greatest blessings of life, is a sin, an unnatural crime, "an accursed thing," and recommend unbounded prostitution, unchecked and universal lewdness, absolute promiscuous intercourse, and point us to the brutes for an example. 4. You wish to form armed communities, in order to extirpate, in imitation of your infidel predecessors, the religion of Christ from the earth, and by force of arms compel the nations to adopt your Godless, Soul-less, and Lawless system of infidelity. 5. You intend to break up single family arrangements, and force men to live together like droves of filthy swine or packs of hounds. 6. You aim at taking from parents their children, and having them trained by unfeeling nurses. 7. You are trying to induce governments to patronize those schemes of cruelty and uncleanness, and use their fleets and armies to bring them into operation. 8. These and

many other abominations and cruelties, some of them too indecent and horrible to be named, are parts of your system, as is plain from your published works, and these are the reasons why we oppose you. I am prepared to prove these charges against your system before the public in open discussion; I have proved them already in my "Overthrow of Infidel Socialism;" and the reason why I do not fully prove them now is, that Lloyd Jones will not allow me the space for my Appendix agreed upon by the Committees. And these are the men who talk about doing us good. The shamelessness and impudence of infidelity know no bounds.

I cannot pass unnoticed Lloyd Jones's repeated mention of a Creator, Divine Being, &c. It should be known that Socialists do not believe in a God, or a future life, and that they use these words only for a cloak. This conduct is unmanly. Why be ashamed of their principles, if they be good; and if they be bad, why want us to adopt them? To take the name of God, and apply it to some unknown chemical power, is unworthy quibbling. And to talk of a future life, when all that they mean is, the passing of the matter of our dead bodies first into worms, then into grass and flowers, and to call this immortality, is conduct of which any but an unbeliever would be ashamed.

Lloyd Jones says, page 127, that he "believes too well of the Regulator of the universe, to think that he will punish him as a man, whatever speculative mistakes he may fall into." This was the way Rousseau, one of the fathers of the Social system, spoke, when he was spending his days in licentiousness, exposing his new-born children in the street, and labouring to spread those principles which filled the Continent with pollution and blood. "Speculative mistakes," indeed! The Gospel never teaches us that any will be punished for "speculative mistakes," but it nevertheless teaches us, that neither fornicators, nor adulterers, nor drunkards, nor unclean persons, nor liars, nor revilers, shall inherit the kingdom of God. Lloyd Jones says he cares not whether Infidelity or Christianity or Socialism prevails; if the

human race is made happy, he will be satisfied. But if Lloyd Jones is still in doubt which system is best calculated to make men happy, he should not stand forward as a reformer. It would be well for him to examine Christianity, and try it for himself, and then he will not be so careless as to which system prevails. His carelessness is nothing to his credit.

*Observations on some parts of Lloyd Jones's former Speeches.*

On page 7, Lloyd Jones says that he never said that Christianity produced all the crime and misery in the country, and that no other person belonging to the society to which he belongs ever made such a statement. To this I answer, 1. I received a letter from Rowbottom, Socialist lecturer, of Stockport, offering to prove, if I would meet him in discussion, that Christianity is the cause of all the crime and misery of the country. 2 G. A. Fleming, another Social lecturer, and Editor of the *New Moral World*, in his "Infidelity of Professed Christianity," page 6, says, "History remains to tell us all what sort of fruit the Christian tree has yielded,—the plunder, the oppression and the degradation of our race,"—and throughout his pamphlet he represents Christianity as the cause of all our crime and miseries. 3. Robert Owen charges religion, and he mentions the Christian religion by name, with introducing into society "anger, hatred, jealousy, envy, strife, murder, wars and massacres; with maintaining ignorance, being the cause of poverty, and the sole cause of all the wickedness and misery experienced by the human race." (See his *Manchester Lectures*, page 16, 17.)

In his discussion with Alexander Campbell, of America, R. Owen undertook to prove, "1. That all the religions of the world have been founded on the ignorance of mankind. 2. That they are directly opposed to the never-changing laws of human nature. 3. That they have been, and are, the real source of vice, disunion, and misery of every description. 4. That they are now the only real bar to the formation of a society of virtue,

of intelligence, of charity in the most extended sense, and of sincerity and kindness among the whole human family." (See page 30, English edition.) On page 36, he adds, "To me, they all (*i. e.* all religions, Christian as well as others,) appear to be one and the same in principle, and in general practice, except the difference in the rites and ceremonies, which I deem mere forms."

To prove the falsehood of Lloyd Jones's statement beyond dispute, I will give a copy of a handbill, put out on Monday, July 1st., by the resident missionary of Newcastle-on-Tyne, named James Campbell, which I have now in my possession :—

"To the Clergy and others of all denominations.—A Public Discussion on the effects of Christianity, as hitherto and at present taught and practised, will take place this evening, in the Music Hall, Nelson-street, when it will be contended that all our political, social, and domestic evils arise from the practice of Christianity. Chair to be taken at eight o'clock precisely. Twenty minutes will be allowed for the first and second speakers, afterwards ten minutes each, and no person will be allowed to speak a second time while there is another speaker on the same side. To defray expenses, one penny will be taken at the door.—Printed for D. France and Co."

I met this Socialist missionary myself in the discussion, when this bill was fastened up before the audience as the ground of the debate. I would add, that the Socialists, when they do not openly assert that Christianity is the cause of all our crime and misery, *insinuate* it in all their writings, as a perusal of their pamphlets will show.

On page 12, Lloyd Jones tells us, that Victor, the Roman prelate, excommunicated the Eastern churches, and this he brings forward as a proof that Christianity is a persecuting system. I would observe, 1. That what Victor did in this matter was the conduct of an individual only; Christianity had nothing to do with it, nor had the Christian churches. In what Victor did, he went directly against the doctrines and principles of Christianity, and against the wishes of the churches and the ministers of the churches too. "When Victor, Bishop of Rome," says King, in his celebrated work on the Primitive Church, "had excommunicated the

Eastern churches, because they continued to observe that feast on a different time from the churches of the West, not only the bishops of the adverse party, but even those of his own side, condemned him as rash, heady, and turbulent." It would have been a wonder indeed, if, in the course of nearly two hundred years, Lloyd Jones could not have found, in all the churches, consisting of many scores if not hundreds of thousands of persons, one single individual that acted inconsistently with his principles. But what sort of an argument is this ? He might as well have attempted to prove that Christianity tended to make men theatrical performers, for surely one individual might be found, by examining the history of the church for two hundred years, who so far declined from his profession as to become a theatrical performer. 2. Lloyd Jones should have told us that this breach of the church's peace was healed by the mild and Christian interposition of Ireneus, Bishop of Lyons. 3. The dispute was not about "a mere difference of opinion," as Lloyd Jones says, but about a difference of customs: there does not appear to have been any difference of opinion in the churches on this point at all. 4. False opinions as to the nature of belief had, therefore, nothing to do with the matter. 5. What Lloyd Jones says about cursing, about inflicting pains and penalties, is all a falsehood. There were no such things. It was a bare verbal communication. (See Mosheim, page 152, &c.)

In the third century, there was another Bishop of Rome named Stephen, that excommunicated the Asiatic churches on account of a difference of opinion, but he too was censured by the other bishops as well as by the churches, as a breaker and disturber of the churches' peace, because that he would impose upon others the belief of a disputable point, which, as Firmilian contended, "*was never wont to be done*, but every church followed their own different ways; and never therefore broke the unity and peace of the church, which now," says he, "Stephen dares to do, and breaks that peace which the ancient bishops always preserved in mutual love and

honour." Such was the doctrine and practice of the churches for three hundred years. The Council of Carthage laid down the same peaceful and liberal doctrine at this time. "It now remains," says the act of that council, "that every one of us declare our judgments concerning this matter, judging no man, and removing no one from our communion, for thinking otherwise than we do." (King on the Primitive Church.) Thus did the churches, consisting of innumerable thousands of persons, live in peace and harmony, tolerating one another, for nearly three hundred years; while only two men are found, in all that time, setting aside the authority of Christ, and attempting, in defiance of the spirit and precepts of the Gospel, to usurp dominion over the consciences of their fellow men. The history of the universe besides cannot present another such an instance of the long and extensive triumph of liberty and love, as is here presented in the church of Christ. There is no other system on earth that could have produced such effects: the religion of Christ alone could thus turn the savage tempers of the Gentile world into peace and love. And yet it is hither that Lloyd Jones comes to seek for arguments to prove that Christianity is a persecuting system.

A man sows wheat in his field—I know it is wheat from its appearance and taste—and where he sows it, wheat springs up: but it is found, after a while, that in the field, along with the wheat, there has sprung up here and there a thistle also. This is just as might be expected; for the ground on which the wheat was sown, had borne thistles previously, and it would have been strange indeed if neither root nor seed had been left in the field. But now a man comes forward and assures you, that the seed which the farmer sowed was thistle seed, and that those two or three thistles are the natural crop. You tell him, That cannot be, for that in two hundred and fifty acres there are but two or three thistles to be found; while all the rest is nicely covered over with a healthful crop of wheat. Still the man talks about the thistles; he points you to them; he says they are there; he takes them in his hands

and holds them up ; he puts them in your faces, and with all the fierceness and fire of his enraged soul, he stares at you, and shakes his clenched fist, and dares you to question the fact, and defies the world to prove that they are not thistles. What would you say to such a man ? You would think him a madman or a deceiver. Just so it is with my opponent. Christ sowed good wheat in his field, and the crop was wheat ; only in the space of two hundred and fifty years there sprung up two thistles, Victor, and Stephen, Bishops of Rome. Lloyd Jones discovers this, and contends that it was thistle seed that Christ sowed. I produce the seed basket, containing samples of the seed Christ sowed, and it is all wheat ; I show him that the thistles are not one in fifty thousand ; and I also give him proof from ancient history that the ground on which Christ sowed his seed used to bear persecuting thistles before, and that therefore a few thistles might naturally be looked for. But all is of no use to the new prophet ; he shouts and raves and clenches his hands, and repeats it, that there are thistles there, - and on his word he assures you that Christ sowed them. What can we do with him ? We must leave him with his thistles, and we will rejoice in the harvest of better things which both in time and in eternity is ripening for us.

On page 13, Lloyd Jones pretends that there are so many differences of opinion in the world as to what Christianity is, that it is impossible to tell what it is. He says this in order to justify himself in taking the opinions of a few deranged or ignorant or depraved men, and calling *them* Christianity, instead of taking the system as it is plainly laid down in the New Testament. This is a most unworthy course of proceeding. 1. The differences existing among people as to what Christianity is, throw no difficulty in the way of deciding this question. Let a thousand impartial persons read the New Testament simply to ascertain whether it encourages persecution and blood, and there will not be a difference of opinion among them. All will agree that there is not a passage in favour of any such thing, but that the book is full of passages of a contrary kind, which enjoin meekness, and gentleness, and love.

2. Suppose I should charge Socialism with encouraging theft, and Lloyd Jones should ask me for my proof, would it be enough for me to say, A man in Germany understood it to do so? Would not Lloyd Jones say, The man misunderstood Socialism? And if I should say there were so many differences of opinion in the world as to what Socialism really was, that I could not allow him to be an infallible judge what it was, would he not charge me with quibbling? Just such is Lloyd Jones's conduct in reference to Christianity.

"There are so many differences of opinion about what Christianity is," says Lloyd Jones. Either Lloyd Jones knows very little about religious sects, or else he knows that their differences of opinion about what Christianity is are comparatively trifling. Take twenty of those sects who regard the New Testament as the standard of Christian doctrine, and what are their differences of opinion as to what Christianity is? Does one sect think it teaches lying, another that it teaches truth? Does one think it teaches persecution, and another that it teaches love and gentleness? No such thing. There is not on any of these points a single difference of opinion. They all know that the religion of Christ is a religion of truth and love and gentleness. They all differ from one another on some less important matters, but they all agree that Jesus of Nazareth went about doing good, and that every Christian ought to follow his example. Nay, so plain is the New Testament on those points, that infidels themselves have been generally agreed, that as a moral system it has no equal in the universe.

Suppose a man should say that there were so many differences of opinion about the laws of England, that no one could tell whether they forbade theft and murder or not,—what would people say of him? They would at once answer, We grant that lawyers dispute about a vast number of nice points of law, but that the laws forbid theft and murder, the most ignorant in the country know. So with the New Testament. There are differences of opinion about many matters of speculation, but the child that is not five years old, the savage, who for the first



time in his life is learning to read and to think, the Jew, the Mahometan, the Hindoo, men of all lands and of all creeds can see, that the religion of the New Testament is a religion of gentleness and love. So plain and palpable and uniform is the doctrine of Christianity against all persecution and bitterness; so plain, so palpable and uniform is its doctrine in favour of universal and impartial and unwearied and persevering charity, that no man can call its meaning in question, unless he has some bad reason for so doing. Such attempts at misleading the minds of men are unworthy of man. They show the mind of the man that makes them to be in a very bad state.

But Beza understood the passage in Acts to sanction persecution, says Lloyd Jones. I would be ashamed of such a defence. If Beza did so understand one passage, what then? It would be strange indeed if there were not a few insane men in the world, but whoever thinks of setting the opinion of one madman against ten thousand sane men, unless he has some unworthy object in view in so doing? There have been a few who have professed to doubt of their own existence; but is our existence therefore a doubtful matter? To what unworthy shifts may a bad cause drive a man!

One page 12, Lloyd Jones says, that the very moment the Christians began to differ in opinion, they began to inflict pains and penalties upon each other; but on page 13 he says that they had not at that time any means of persecuting, because they themselves were not tolerated in the Roman empire. Thus in the compass of one page can my opponent contradict himself.

On page 23, Lloyd Jones says—"Mr. Barker tells you there are passages of an opposite description in the Bible." I said no such thing. I neither said nor meant that there were some passages in the New Testament that sanctioned persecution, and others of an opposite description which forbade it. This insinuation that there are passages of opposite descriptions is of Lloyd Jones's own making, and is altogether false. What I say is, that the passages Lloyd Jones quoted do not sanction persecu-

tion; that there is not a passage in the whole New Testament in favour of persecution, but that there are hundreds against persecution.

On page 23, Lloyd Jones says—"Those passages, Mr. Barker told you, where it is said 'Let a man be rejected,' 'Let a man be accursed,' on account of his opinions." This also is a false quotation, both of the Scriptures and of my words. The Scriptures do not say "Let a man be rejected" or "accursed," on *account of his opinions*, but on account of *heresy*. And so far from calling heresies mere opinions, I expressly stated, that heresies consisted more in wicked conduct than in erroneous opinions. The kind of heretic mentioned in Titus, iii. 59, was one who was *subverted*, that is, turned entirely away from the Gospel, to a system of an opposite character; he was one that "sinned and was condemned in his own mind," (verse 10,) a self-convicted profligate. Those mentioned in Gal. i. 7, 8, who were to be "accursed" or "cut off," or in better words, disowned, separated from Christian fellowship, were persons who preached another Gospel, which, indeed, was not a Gospel, and overthrew the Gospel of Christ. They were sensual, hypocritical unbelievers.

On page 23, Lloyd Jones says, that the persecutors whom he had mentioned, namely, Victor, &c. drew the doctrine of persecution from those passages of Scripture which he read over, and that they quoted those passages to sanction persecution. I have examined the history of Victor, &c. but I cannot find the least ground that Lloyd Jones could have for this assertion. There is not a word in all the Church History to warrant Lloyd Jones's assertion; it is manifestly a pure fabrication, an unmixed untruth. He tells us on the same page, "that the Christians of those days drew from the New Testament the doctrine of persecution;" this also is entirely of his own making; there is not one word of truth in it. Lloyd Jones denies afterwards, it will be seen, having made those charges. How awful, that men should thus recklessly set at nought the truth! What must be the nature of that cause, which requires such criminal efforts for its support?

On page 24, Lloyd Jones says—"Mr. Barker himself does not always put this construction on those texts." Yes, always. If I ever gave any other interpretation, let Lloyd Jones please to produce it.

On the same page Lloyd Jones insinuates that the Quakers are the only sect I can bring forward as opposed to persecution, &c. No such thing. I refer to them because they are among the oldest of the English sects, and because their principles are so well and so generally known.

Lloyd Jones says, pages 24 and 25, that "there are some dispositions which are naturally kind, and that some are very kind. Penn's seems to have been one of this description." Answer:—The freedom from persecution of which I speak was not confined to Penn, it was the character of the whole sect with which Penn was connected. Penn was but the representative of scores of thousands, all bearing the same character, and breathing the same spirit. Penn is mentioned because his eminence as an author, as a man of influence, and the founder of a new empire, make him better known; and not as being superior in spirit to the tens of thousands of his community. And many of those were not men that were naturally kind; they were men that had been naturally savage and fierce, as men generally are. Some of them were bred to arms, and were as ready to resent an injury, or to join in persecution, as other men, as might be proved from the history of the Quakers by many striking instances, if I were allowed space; but Christianity had changed their natures. It was their new nature, begotten in them by the word of God, that made them such examples of meekness and affection. It was because they were Christians that they were so free from the spirit of persecution.

On page 25, Lloyd Jones says that one of Constantine's first acts after his conversion, was to hinder the celebration of the Pagan worship, &c. This is altogether untrue. One of Constantine's first acts after he professed to embrace Christianity, was, to give liberty to all persons to adhere to what religion they thought proper, and to

profess and exercise it unmolested. His designs with respect to Paganism, were only made known towards the latter part of his life, by the edicts he issued for destroying the heathen temples, &c. (See Mosheim, 237, edit. 1826. Constantine's Life, &c.)

On page 27, Lloyd Jones says, that he is "condemning Christians out of the mouths of Christians themselves." This is not true. The Christians to whose works Lloyd Jones refers never do condemn Christians; they simply give an account of *anti-Christian* persecutions, to show men the danger of deviating from the tolerant and loving doctrines of Christianity.

He then professes to give an account of the first general council, and of the edict of Constantine against Arius; of all which I would observe, that there is nothing authentic or correct in the whole account. Mosheim, the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, observes, "There is no part of the history of the church that has been unfolded with such negligence, or rather passed over with such rapidity, as the history of this council. The ancient writers are neither agreed concerning the time nor the place in which it was assembled, the number of those who sat in council, nor the bishop who presided in it. *No authentic acts of its famous sentence have been committed to writing, or at least none have been transmitted to our times.*" (p. 304, 305.) Where then did Lloyd Jones get his information? As to what he gives as the edict of Constantine, it bears the marks of a forgery on its very face. It appears to me that Lloyd Jones has an ecclesiastical history of his own, made up of the calumnies and forgeries of a number of quarrelsome and envious pretenders and unbelievers; for I look in vain for his representations of things in the regular histories of the church. This should be borne in mind by the readers of this debate, or they may be greatly misled. It is also well worthy of remark, that persecution did not show itself in what is called the Christian church at all, until the bishops had begun to lay aside the principles of Christ, and meet together to legislate contrary to Christ's doctrine. In all cases it is the want of Christianity that gives rise to persecution.

Another device of Lloyd Jones deserves notice : when he gives you an account of any person, he does not give you the account of any impartial man, but the account of his enemies. When he pretends to describe the doctrine of Alexander, on page 26, he does it in the words of Arius, the opponent of Alexander ; so when he pretends to give you an account of the proceedings of Arius, on page 40, he gives you the words of Athanasius, the opponent of Arius. This is the course Lloyd Jones uniformly pursues. Any slander that was ever uttered by one person against another, however false, is brought forward as good history by Lloyd Jones, whenever it suits his unholy purposes.

On page 40, Lloyd Jones talks of the cruelties of the Vandals, (who had no more to do with Christianity than the savages of North America,) and shamefully insinuates that their wars were the effects of Christianity. With as much reason might I attribute the brightness of the sun to the influences of Socialism. Lloyd Jones's statement, that the Vandals were partly Pagans and partly Arians, is an entirely groundless falsehood.

What Lloyd Jones says about Julian, on page 41, appears to be another of Lloyd Jones's forgeries. Julian had been dead from one to two hundred years at the time that Lloyd Jones represents him as speaking against the Christians. I am amazed at those endless falsifications of history. I cannot find one fact honestly represented in all Lloyd Jones's historical references. To expose all his misrepresentations would require a volume. The story about Hypatia, on page 43, is another instance of Lloyd Jones's utter disregard of truth.

On pages 41 and 42, Lloyd Jones says I have nothing to do with the system of the Socialists in this discussion. I answer, I have this to do with it ; Lloyd Jones says, that the *only* root of persecution is a mistaken notion of human nature, or the Christian doctrine that man is accountable for his belief. I proved Lloyd Jones's notion to be false, by showing that *the Socialists*, as well as other infidels who reject this doctrine (which he calls a "false conception of human nature") and every other

doctrine of Christianity, are persecutors also, and enforce persecution both by precept and example. My argument is unanswerable; it entirely overthrows the whole of Lloyd Jones's theory, and this is the reason why he thus dishonourably evades the point. But Lloyd Jones is willing to discuss with me the tendency of his principles, he says. I have no objections to do so; I have offered to discuss the merits of Socialism with Lloyd Jones, and Lloyd Jones shrunk from the discussion. I am prepared to prove it to be an immoral, a licentious, and a cruel system; the true cause of those very evils which Lloyd Jones foolishly charges on the religion of Christ: indeed this I have already done in my *Overthrow of Infidel Socialism*.

Lloyd Jones says, page 42, that John Wesley wrote against Catholic emancipation, and on page 114, he quotes a sentence from an old edition of a tract, that I wrote many years ago, in which he thinks I speak too strongly of Voltaire and Carlile, and this to prove that Christianity produces persecution! Did ever mortal hear such arguments before! John Wesley once, in sixty years, wrote a pamphlet that Lloyd Jones thinks was not as liberal as it should be—therefore the New Testament causes persecution. Joseph Barker, when he was a youth, wrote two sentences, which he thinks were rather strong, which he left out in his next edition of his pamphlet—therefore the Gospel is a system of persecution. And these are the strong arguments of infidelity! Because the fire does not warm every corner of the house as soon as it is kindled, the fire is to be blamed for all the coldness in the country. Because the school-master does not teach his scholars every thing in a day, he is to be considered the cause of all the ignorance in the world! Such is the reasoning of Lloyd Jones. When Socialism has produced a few such men as Wesley, who nobly turned aside his thoughts from ease and pleasure and selfish interests, and gave himself, through the course of a long life, to incredible and ceaseless labours and sufferings, to promote the temporal and eternal happiness of the poor and neglected, of his fellow men,—when Socialism has produced a few such men as Wesley, so noble, so cou-

rageous, so disinterested, and withal so pure, that the sharp malignant eye of infidelity can only find one spot in all his character, and that a faint one; I say, when Socialism has produced a few such men as Wesley, who by his disinterested labours has blessed all quarters of the world, and secured a name for benevolence and purity throughout all lands and throughout all time;—when Socialism has produced a few such characters as these, then let it come before the world again, and men will show it greater favour.

“It is all very well,” says Lloyd Jones, on page 44, “to say that we shall not find these things in the Gospel: but I say the story of the miraculous conception is in the Gospel,” &c. Did ever mortal hear such reasoning before? The story of the miraculous conception is in the Gospel,—therefore all people who persecute are taught to persecute by the Gospel. Alas for humanity.

On the same page (44) Lloyd Jones says, “When a man does not view things in the same light as we do, the rational mode of proceeding is, to lay such evidence before his mind as may lead him to change his views; a mode,” he adds, “which the Gospel does not teach.” After all that I have seen of the blinding and corrupting power of infidelity, I am still astonished at the recklessness with which Lloyd Jones repeats his false charges against the Gospel, and that in the face of persons who can go to the Gospel and examine it for themselves. The mode of proceeding towards those who differ from us, mentioned by Lloyd Jones, is the mode taught by the Gospel from first to last, (see page 45,) and it is the *only* mode which the Gospel allows to be practised. If Lloyd Jones will produce one single passage that teaches any other mode,—if he will produce a single passage from the whole New Testament that recommends any thing like the dungeons recommended by Robert Owen, called Physical, Intellectual and Moral Hospitals, or any passage recommending Christian communities to learn the use of arms, and to practise military movements, in order to *over-rule* the minds and conduct of mankind, let him do it; if he cannot, and every body

acquainted with the New Testament knows he cannot, then let him come forwards like an honest man, and confess his error or his guilt, in thus calumniating the Gospel before the world.

What is said on page 55 by Lloyd Jones, against the work of Beza, appears to me to be like the rest of his facts; I can find no proof that Beza wrote in favour of Christian churches using persecution. If however he did do so, it was Beza's own error, and not the fault of the Gospel.

On page 55, Lloyd Jones says, that "since Christ came there never was a tolerating government." What does he mean? Does he mean that our government *compels* us all to adopt one set of opinions, and to follow one kind of worship? If so, every man in the country can contradict him. Does he mean that there is no government that has carried out toleration to perfection? Supposing this to be the case, is Christianity to be called a persecuting system, because no government has carried out its tolerant principles to perfection? R. Owen acknowledges that America and England are the most tolerant governments on earth, and yet these are the countries in which Christianity is most prevalent. And Lloyd Jones says, on page 6, that he is proud the day has arrived, when we can come boldly and *freely* before the public, and canvass every question that has any bearing, directly or indirectly, upon human happiness, and do it without any degree of fear as to our personal safety. Is not this toleration?

Is Lloyd Jones acquainted with the American governments which tolerated Robert Owen's schemes at New Harmony? Did he ever read the laws of the state of Pennsylvania, as acted on for the first seventy years of that state? What does Lloyd Jones mean? I think he is attempting to deceive us, by using the word toleration in some new Socialist sense. Does he mean, that no government is tolerant unless it will tolerate men in rapes, and adulteries, and seductions, and unnatural crimes, and child-murder? This, I believe, is his meaning; this appears to me to be the toleration pleaded for by the



Socialists in their writings. I wish Lloyd Jones would speak his mind freely.

But if it were true that there had been no tolerating government since Christ came, it would prove nothing against Christianity, unless it were also proved that Christianity is opposed to toleration.

On page 78, Lloyd Jones says that when he gave, on the first night, a history of the proceedings of the early Christians, he gave the texts of Scripture from the New Testament, which they themselves quoted in support of such proceedings. Now let me here remark, 1. That the early Christians did not persecute. 2. That those corrupt professors whom he mentions, who in after ages did persecute, did not produce those Scripture passages to support their persecutions. When men began to persecute, they began also to conceal the Scriptures from the public, well knowing that the Scriptures were against all persecution.

On page 81, Lloyd Jones says the popes attached a very different meaning to the word "accursed" used in Gal. i. 8, 9. But what does this prove? If Robert Owen should attach another meaning to the word, and say it meant a "moral hospital," or a "complicated military movement," what honest man would attempt to make the Apostle or the Gospel answerable for his mistake? I wonder that any man should have the recklessness to reason thus.

On page 81, Lloyd Jones says—"If they had been supplied with a sufficiency of evidence, belief would have followed." What will he assert next? Who does not know, that a man's belief does not depend upon the amount of evidence which is offered him, but on the attention and regard which he chooses to pay to that evidence? Offer the fullest evidence in the world to a man who is wallowing in sensuality and drunkenness, and it will have no effect on him whatever; but offer the same evidence to a man that is attending to his duty as a rational and accountable being, and who is desirous to know, and obey the truth, and he will be convinced at once. There has always been sufficient evidence afforded of the truth of the Gospel, wherever it

has been promulgated; and when men with well-disposed minds have attended to that evidence, they have been convinced. But no evidence can convince a man that is bent upon living in sin, and who disables and deranges his mental powers by lewdness and intemperance. Evidence is to the mind like light to the eye: all the light in the world cannot make a man see that either shuts his eyes or puts them out. If a man should say—"Give the man light enough, and he will see," when he knew at the same time that the man had put out his eyes, you would take the man to be quibbling or else mad. No arguments will have any effect upon dogs and swine, because they have not capacities to take them in; and there are some men who so far imitate the dogs and the swine, that, as the Saviour intimates, to offer them arguments or good advice, would be worse than a waste of time. "Give not that which is holy to the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you." (Matt. vii. 6.) It is no wonder that such as follow the advice of Robert Owen, to imitate the brutes, should at length be reduced to a level with the brutes in point of capacity. But in vain will be such attempt to lay the blame of their unbelief upon a want of evidence.

On page 88, Lloyd Jones tells us that Luther sanctioned persecution, and that Calvin wrote in its favour. We answer, it would have been strange indeed if Luther and Calvin, who had been trained up in ignorance of the Gospel, under a system that in a great measure kept the sacred writings in concealment, and set up man's traditions in the place of Christ,—I say it would have been strange if those great men had been perfect as soon as ever their minds broke loose from the anti-christian yoke. It is a great honour to the Gospel that they had so little to do with persecution; and it is no dishonour to the Gospel, but only to the evil system under which they had been bred, that they were not quite perfect. But Melancthon, Lloyd Jones said, could not condemn Calvin's conduct to Servetus. Indeed; then if Lloyd Jones speaks the truth, Melancthon once in his whole life got wrong, it seems. And

so, because a man in writing fifty books happens to let slip one faulty expression, and because, in sixty years' good conduct there is one flaw, Lloyd Jones would have us to believe that the Gospel is a bad system. This is his argument. When such arguments as these will pass for demonstrations, infidelity will begin to triumph. But Lloyd Jones talks about Melancthon's head. We would observe, that a man's principles and practice determine the form of his head, so that he who was naturally fierce and bloody, shall, by the influence of good religious principles and a good conduct grounded thereon, become mild and charitable. The organs of destructiveness and malevolence shall sink, and the organs of benevolence and sympathy shall rise. "Since the introduction of Christianity into our country, the general shape of the English head is altered," says Combe; "destructiveness is smaller, and the opposite organ larger." So with Melancthon: that beautiful specimen of benevolent formation is probably owing to the influence of Christianity, that system of love and tenderness to which he had so uniformly subjected his soul and his conduct. What Lloyd Jones says about the council of Geneva, appears to be another of his own fictions. What he says about V. Gentilis also appears to be false.

On page 98, Lloyd Jones tells us that the increase of toleration, and the numerous improvements in the state of society, which we attribute to the influence of Christianity, are the effects of philosophy. The folly and weakness of this device of Lloyd Jones may be easily made manifest. 1. How is it that philosophy has not produced those happy improvements any where but where Christianity has been received? Go amongst the nations where Christianity is unknown, and you will find philosophy has done nothing there. Go back to those ages when Christianity was unknown in our own country, and philosophy did nothing for us then. How is it that philosophy does no good any where but where Christianity prevails, and that the good that is done in any country is in proportion to the regard which is paid to Christianity in that country? How is it that philosophy has done more for the Methodists, the Quakers, and the Moravians, who seldom men-

tion philosophy, than for other parts of the community who make great boasts of philosophy, and pay little respect to religion? Is it not plain that Lloyd Jones's assertion is a mere device, or a flat contradiction to the truth?

But to make the folly and emptiness of Lloyd Jones's talk about philosophy still plainer, we would observe, that there are but three kinds of philosophy. 1. That of the ancient Pagans. 2. That of modern infidels. And 3. The philosophy of Christianity. Let us see which of these kinds of philosophy has produced all those good effects of which we have been speaking.

And first, with respect to the philosophy of the ancient Heathens: this could not produce the good effects in question. It could not do away with persecution, for the greatest philosophers of Greece inculcated intolerance as necessary to the welfare of the state. Mæcenas, in his counsels to Augustus, directs him to "honour the gods according to the customs of his fathers, and *compel others* to honour them: to take and punish those who innovate in religion, and to suffer no Atheists or magicians." Even the laws which the philosophers of Athens and Rome framed for imaginary republics, were intolerant. Plato does not give his citizens liberty of worship, and Cicero expressly forbids them to have any other gods than those of the state. We might mention Tacitus, Pliny, Marcus Antoninus, and many more of the great philosophers of ancient times, all of them opposed to toleration; all of them favouring persecution, and many of them besmearing their hands in the blood of the noblest and best of men. As to the abolition of slavery, the amelioration of slavery, the relief of the poor, and the general improvement and elevation of the human species, these were things which the great philosophers among the gentiles never dreamed of. On the other hand, they taught the most unclean and debasing sentiments, and practised the most infamous vices without shame. Theft, the exposure of infants, a community of wives, unnatural crimes, the resistance of injuries, and other evils and abominations too numerous to be mentioned, were inculcated and practised by them.

Lloyd Jones will not choose to attribute much good to this class of philosophers, surely.

The next class of philosophers are the infidel philosophers. Those are the men of whom Lloyd Jones makes his boast. Let us see what good is to be looked for from this sort of philosophy. 1. If we examine the doctrines of R. Owen, and of those other infidel philosophers which come nearest to the system of Robert Owen and Lloyd Jones, we shall find their doctrines to be nearly as follows:—1. That there is no God. 2. That man is a creature of circumstances. 3. That men ought to indulge their passions and propensities without restraint. 4. That man is not responsible for his conduct; that a murderer and a kidnapper is no more to be blamed than the noblest philanthropists and martyrs. 5. That fornication and adultery are lawful and right, and that marriage is an unnatural crime. 6. That there is no benevolent and intelligent providence. 7. That there is no future life of consciousness for man. 8. That it is lawful to lie, or to do any thing else that they may think right. 9. That self-murder is lawful and right. 10. That parents are not fit to bring up their own children. 11. That man is a mere animal machine. 12. That a desire to commit adultery, fornication, or any other thing is no more shameful than to desire bread when hungry. 13. That though men are not to blame for murder, theft, &c., it is nevertheless right to put them into moral, physical, and intellectual hospitals, to whip, starve, chain, or hang them, either for their own good, or to furnish good circumstances to form the characters of others. 14. That men and women should herd together like brute beasts; that promiscuous intercourse, like that which prevails among other animals, is the only proper kind of sexual intercourse. 15. That infidels should form themselves into armed communities, learn the use of fire arms and other arms, as well as the more complicated military movements, that they may be able not only to defend themselves, but also, by the terror and force of arms, compel all others to abandon their religion, and join themselves with the armed infidels. These and other doctrines which decency cannot name, are the leading doctrines of modern

infidel philosophers. These are the doctrines of Robert Owen, the founder of the sect to which Lloyd Jones belongs. I will leave the public to judge how much good this kind of philosophy is likely to produce. What sort of effects it has produced thus far, one may learn from the lives of the leading philosophers themselves, and from the immoral characters of the leading persons in connexion with the Social institutions in our country. The lewdness, the bitterness, the deadly and implacable hatred and malignity, the persecuting fury, the misanthropy, the ungovernable enmity against religion, the cruelty and blood which are unfolded in the history of this system of philosophy, form the darkest and most horrible pages of the history of mankind.\*

The only remaining system of philosophy is Christianity. This system of philosophy, we are ready enough to acknowledge, is the cause of all those blessed improvements which have been effected in the world for the last eighteen hundred years. The great founder of this system was Jesus Christ, and his great principles of truth, and temperance, and charity, are known to the very children in the streets. The history of this kind of philosophy is the history of beneficence and purity from first to last. Knowledge and freedom and peace and temperance, all temporal and spiritual blessings have followed its steps; and still to whatever country it goes, it carries in its train a little heaven. This is the philosophy that inspired Erasmus, and Grotius, and Luther, and Melancthon, and Hale, and Taylor, and Milton, and Bacon, and Boyle, and Newton, and Locke, and Fox, and Penn, and Howard, and Clarkson, and Raikes, and Hannay, and Reynolds, and Wesley, and Schwartz, and Wilberforce, and Fry, and Eddy, and Williams, and thousands of others, who have consecrated their wealth, their time, their health, and their life to the improvement of their fellow men, to the diffusion of truth, and liberty, and

\* For particulars as to the immoral and cruel tendency of the philosophy of R. Owen and his followers, see "The Overthrow of Infidel Socialism," second edition, and "The Gospel Triumphant," &c.

peace, and joy, to the regeneration and salvation of mankind. This is the philosophy that is at present exerting its salutary and renovating influence upon all the institutions of our country, and upon almost all the nations of the earth. This is the only philosophy that has ever essentially benefited mankind. All the wise and salutary principles that are to be found in other systems, are but so many rays proceeding from this sun : this is the fountain of all the true philosophical light of a moral kind in the universe.

What then does Lloyd Jones's objection amount to ? It is a mere play upon words. It is as if a man should say, It is not the sun that makes the day ; the day is caused by the light which flows from a vast luminous body in the heavens. What luminous body is there in the heavens to give us so much light, except the sun ? The whole is a mere evasion, an attempt to darken a plain truth, by words of doubtful meaning.

On pages 96 and 97, Lloyd Jones says several things in favour of Voltaire. I am sorry to be obliged so often to correct Lloyd Jones, but the whole is a misrepresentation. The idea of Voltaire building a colony to keep the Protestants and Catholics from each other, is monstrous. But if Voltaire had done so, for Lloyd Jones to suppose that no Christian had done as much, shows him to be strangely ignorant of Christian history. What did Penn do ? What did the Pilgrim Fathers do ? What did Wesley do ? To think of comparing Voltaire with Christian worthies, is out of all character. As Voltaire appears to be Lloyd Jones's best man, I will give a brief outline of his history.

He was educated by the Jesuits at the school of Louis le Grand, and very early showed a leaning to licentiousness and infidelity. When he left the Jesuits, his father sent him to the schools of law, but he formed a connexion with a number of leading infidels, and all his father's efforts to induce him to devote himself to some regular employment were in vain. He soon became a proficient in lewdness and infidelity. To break him off from his associates, his father sent him into Holland,

but there he seduced a young lady, and conducted himself in other respects so badly, that he was sent back to France in disgrace.

He now pursued clandestine authorship, and meeting both with protection and persecution, he rose to some eminence as a wit. He went on in feasting and wantonness, and writing anonymous pamphlets. He formed an acquaintance with Rousseau, and quarrelled with him, and they were never friends more. He is next found throwing his "Henriad," a poem he had composed, into the fire, in a rage, because some friends whom he had called together to hear it read before its publication, suggested some improvements. He next quarrels with the Chevalier de Rohan, and learns fencing that he may challenge him to a duel, and is sent to the Bastile six months for his pains.

He next came to England, associated with some English infidels, got a large subscription made for him, which laid the foundation of his fortune. He then returned to France, and by lottery gambling and some successful speculations in African wheat and Spanish commerce, greatly increased his stock of money. By army contracts he gained eight hundred thousand francs. He now pursued his work of authorship briskly, but wrote such works for obscenity and blasphemy, that he concealed himself and his name.

He now retired with a lewd woman, of the name of Châtelet, to Cirey, with whom he lived on terms of infamous intimacy. Here he feasted, and wrote, and revelled in uncleanness, and quarrelled with his harlot, corresponded with the infidel King of Prussia, was very miserable, and had the mortification to see his harlot run off with M. de S. Lambert.

He returned to Paris, visited the King of Prussia, got distinctions, a good salary, gay suppers, but showing himself over greedy, he disgusted the king, quarrelled with him, abused the king's literary friends, composed a libel, called "The Private Life of Frederick II.," together with other libels, returned to Paris, but never forgave his infidel brother king Frederick.



He now took up his residence at Ferney, at the age of sixty, where he lived for the last twenty years of his life. Here he educated a daughter of Corneille the dramatist, and got her married: he assisted the family of Calas, and of Sirven. Two young officers, one of them De Barré, were accused of blasphemy and obscenity in their orgies, and with having destroyed a cross at Abbeville. These young men were condemned to death, and De Barré actually suffered. One of Voltaire's works was found in the young man's possession, and had served to corrupt him. When Voltaire cried out against the sentence, it was justly answered, that the guilt also attached to him, for having corrupted the young men's imaginations by his filthy and impious writings.

His chief occupation at Ferney was a bitter and ceaseless war against the religion of Christ. Sometimes it was a large book, sometimes a penny pamphlet; now a treatise on divinity, and then a tale or a song; but hostilities never ceased. Let it be remarked, that it was after he was sixty years of age that his infidelity became most shameless, his ribaldry most insolent, and his obscenity most offensive. Yet with all his zeal for pollution and impiety, such was his timidity, or his consciousness that he was wrong, that all his attacks on Christianity came out with false names, and when they were attributed to him, he would deny them, even with an oath. "Vanity and personal feeling," says my author, "mixed with all his doctrines, and coloured his best works. A disposition to make light of every thing spoils all. He is also ever wanting in impartiality; the promotion of infidelity is ever kept in view, and truth and history are made to bend to this. 'I am tired,' said this poor creature, 'of hearing it said, that twelve men were sufficient to establish the Christian religion; I am anxious to show that it requires but one to destroy it!'" Poor man!

His opposition to Christianity, as one of his biographers observes, did not arise from a love to truth or to mankind, but from the spirit of misanthropy and sensuality. His whole conduct was unworthy of one who pretended to be a reformer of mankind. "Not only was the moral

conduct of Voltaire censurable," says one of his biographers, "and his conversation licentious; but his writings were replete with gross indecency and insulting outrage to all that is modest and uncorrupted. Nor was it merely by the indulgence of sensuality that he was unfit to serve as a model: he was subject to anger, and envy, and hatred, and was full of malice, falsehood, and hypocrisy. Sometimes he would be seen tearing with his teeth a stupid pamphlet, written to depreciate his genius; at another time we find him writing anonymous libels against men whom in public he flattered. And as to his pretensions to benevolence, what was he ready to sacrifice, or even to risk, for the welfare of mankind? By the course he took he gained more power, riches, and fame, than he could possibly have acquired in any other way. As for any serious danger to his life or liberty, there was none; but when the smallest danger appeared, even of his having to encounter the ecclesiastics, what was his conduct? He fled from the danger, made the most hypocritical submissions, feigned what he did not believe, and professed himself a disciple of that religion which he daily insulted. In writing to Mr. and Mlle. d'Argental, he says,—‘My angels, if I had a hundred thousand men, I know what I would do: but as I have them not, I shall take the Sacrament at Easter, and you may call me hypocrite as long as you please. No, my dear marquis, no! the modern Socrates will not drink hemlock.’” In the same sense he wrote that, “if he lived at Abbeville, he would take the Sacrament every fortnight.” (Correspondance.) Is this the man that is to be compared with Him who laid down his life for mankind, and freely sealed the truth with his blood? Is this the man who is exalted above those martyrs to the interests of truth and human happiness, of which the history of Christianity is full?

That Voltaire did some good I do not pretend to deny: the most malignant and selfish and debauched characters in the universe will sometimes do a kind turn. Nero himself was kind on occasions, and murderers and thieves are kind and honest when it suits their interests, and it

will sometimes happen that men are placed in such circumstances, that they are obliged to do some seeming act of kindness, or fall into disgrace. This was the case with Voltaire ; and hence, from the midst of a long life of pollution, and deceit, and rage, and malignity, there appear some particles of better seeming things, like here and there a spark amidst the smoky clouds of a troubled volcano. But none that had any regard to truth and decency would ever think of comparing such a character with the peaceful, the pure, the chaste, the benevolent and godlike lives of such men as Howard, and Boyle, and Penn, and Wesley, and thousands more, who have made it their business and felt it their happiness to toil and plan and suffer for the welfare of their fellow men.

I may just observe in conclusion, that what Lloyd Jones says about founding a colony to keep the Protestants and Catholics from each other, is the wildest romance ; he never did any such thing. Lloyd Jones must think his readers awfully ignorant indeed, or he must be strangely regardless of his character, or he could never hazard such unfounded statements. There is scarce one statement of Lloyd Jones's in reference to matters of history, which will bear investigation.

If the Bible be plain and easy to be understood, how is it, asks Lloyd Jones (page 97,) that men do not agree about its meaning ? We answer, 1. All have not the same natural strength of understanding. 2. All have not the same helps. 3. All have not the same time. 4. All are not of the same age. 5. All are not equally fond of truth. 6. All are not equally diligent in their endeavours to understand. 7. Some do not like the truth at all ; it does not suit their vicious tastes and ways ; and they therefore love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.

On page 23, Lloyd Jones says, " I am sorry Mr. Barker did not live a thousand years ago. Enlightened Christians *then existed*, and *then persecuted*, because they thought *those passages* [*i. e.* the passages quoted by him] sanctioned it ;" and on page 78, he says, " When I gave you, last night, a history of the proceed-

ings of the early Christians, I gave you the texts of Scripture from the New Testament, which *they themselves* quoted in support of such proceedings." "But mark how soon this man can contradict himself. On page 97, he speaks as follows:—"But Mr. Barker says I told you, that up to the eighth century, they quoted texts in favour of persecution. I told you *no such thing*. I told you they acted as religious men, and persecuted. Beza was the *only* man I spoke of quoting them." On page 23, he says, that a thousand years ago, that is, up to the eighth century, enlightened Christians persecuted, because they thought those passages sanctioned it. On page 78, he says again, "The *early* Christians quoted those texts of Scripture in support of such proceedings," meaning persecutions; and yet he says, on page 97, that he told us no such thing; but that Beza, a man, be it remembered, that lived only about three hundred years ago, was the *only* man he spoke of quoting those passages. What credit can be given to a man who can so strangely contradict himself?

I would further observe if Beza, who did not live till near fifteen hundred years after Christ, was the first who quoted those texts as favourable to persecution, what becomes of all Lloyd Jones's argument? How could those passages cause persecution among the early Christians, if they were never quoted, or understood as favourable to persecution till the days of Beza? It is plain that Lloyd Jones argues and talks at random, without considering or caring what he says.

On page 98, Lloyd Jones tells us that "the whole number of persons massacred on account of religion during the space of fourteen hundred years, amounts to upwards of fifty millions." He might have added, that most of the persons thus murdered were Christians, and that such were their meekness and charity, that they prayed for their murderers. How thankful ought we to be for the religion of Christ, which is so rapidly bringing those massacres to an end!

Lloyd Jones also asks, on page 98, "Where has Christianity overturned priestcraft?" I answer, Everywhere

where it has been received and practised. Lloyd Jones cannot mention a single relic of priestcraft, which the Gospel allows. But priestcraft is not abolished in France, Spain, &c., he says. We answer, No, because men do not practise the Gospel in those countries. Priestcraft is abolished as far as the Gospel is practised, and when the Gospel is fully and generally preached, it will be abolished altogether.

On page 99, Lloyd Jones quotes Howitt on the cruelties of the Spaniards in South America. I also will quote Howitt, to show that he did not, as Lloyd Jones foolishly does, attribute those atrocities to Christianity, but to the want of it. "Christ appeared," says Howitt, "a character and a religion were placed before the eyes of men hitherto inconceivable in the bounty and philanthropy of their nature. Unlike all other founders of a religious faith, Christ had no selfishness, no desire of dominance; and his system, unlike all other systems of worship, was bloodless, boundlessly benevolent, inexpressibly pure, and most marvellous of all, went to break all bonds both of body and soul, and to cast down every temporal and every spiritual tyranny. It was a system calculated for the whole wide universe; adapted to embrace men of all climes, all ages, all ranks of life, or intellect; for the rich and for the poor; for the savage and the civilized; for the fool and the philosopher; for man, woman, and child; a religion which, recognizing the grand doctrine, that 'God made of one blood all nations of the earth,' represented the Almighty as the Father, and all men as brethren born to one universal law,—to the same inalienable rights,—to the same eternal hope. He himself was the living personification of his principles. Demolishing the most inveterate principles of men, by appearing a poor man amongst the poor,—by tearing from aristocratic pride and priestly insolence their masks of most orthodox assurance, by proclaiming that the truth which he taught should make all men free,—by declaring that the Gentiles lorded it over, and oppressed one another, but that it should not be so with his followers,—by putting down

with indignation spiritual pride in high places, and calling the poor and afflicted his brethren, and the objects of his tenderest regard, he laid the foundations of civil and religious freedom, of mental power growing out of unrestrained mental energies, and of love and knowledge co-equal in extension with the world. This perfect freedom of universal man he granted by leaving no decrees; but merely great and everlasting principles, intelligible to the mind and conscience of the whole human race; and on which, men in all countries might found institutions most consonant to their wants. By declaring that 'whenever two or three were met together in his name, he would be in the midst of them,' he cut off for ever every claim, the most specious, of priestly dominance; and by expressing his unqualified and indignant abhorrence of every desire of his disciples 'to call down fire from heaven upon his enemies,' or to forbid those to preach and work miracles in his name, who did not immediately follow him, and conform to his notions, he left to his church a light more resplendent than that of the sun, on the subject of non-interference with the liberty and prerogatives of conscience." Thus far W. Howitt, who knew how to distinguish the religion of Christ from the wicked pretensions and cruel deeds of infidel and bad men.

"What half century has produced more wars than the last?" asks Lloyd Jones, on page 99. And in what half century had infidel philosophers and statesmen so much to do with the affairs of nations? The horrors of the last century should teach us what we are to expect when power falls into the hands of unbelievers. Let any one compare the history of Europe when power was in the hands of such men as the infidel Frederick, and the infidel philosophers of France, with the history of Philadelphia, for seventy years, while under the government of Christians, and you find the secret of the world's troubles, and you see that the only hope of mankind is in the spread of the principles of the Gospel.

On page 102, Lloyd Jones charges me with saying that the Puritans did not persecute. I said no such

thing. I said they understood and practised the Scriptures better than their predecessors, and that they therefore persecuted less ; and Lloyd Jones proves the truth of this, for in the history of the American Puritans, extending over two or three hundreds of years, he can only find two or three instances of persecution, and in those instances, only a few individuals were concerned, out of a number of millions, and those not Christians.

On page 112, Lloyd Jones refers to the Agrarian laws as a proof that the Roman authorities had some charity for the poor of the empire. A few observations on those laws will show that they had nothing whatever to do with charity for the poor.

1. Those laws decreed the distribution only of a portion of the *public* lands, they had nothing to do with the land or the property of individuals. Supposing therefore the Roman governors to have passed these laws to please or benefit the poor, there was nothing in the affair like what we may call the exercise of charity, because they were not giving away any thing of their *own* ; they were simply giving a *portion* of the *public* lands, while they kept their own to themselves, and kept also in their hands a portion of the public lands besides. 2. Those public lands, distributed by the Agrarian law, were chiefly the lands of *other states*. When the Romans had conquered a people in war, they used to take from them their lands or a portion of their lands, and *these* were the lands which were distributed among the Roman citizens. It is poor charity that is founded in robbery. If there had been either justice or charity, such as the Gospel requires, those lands would have been restored to their injured owners. 3. Those lands were not distributed to the poor of the Roman empire, but only to the poorer or less wealthy kind of the citizens, or freemen. Just as if a piece of common land were taken in near Manchester, and given, not to the *poor people* generally, but to the *voters* only. This would leave nine-tenths of the poor just where they were. 4. Those laws were passed by the influence of those voters themselves, and the assistance of two or three or a very few of the wealthier party, who

wished, by favouring such measures, to bribe the freemen to vote for them and support them in their political measures. It was not so much the exercise of charity, therefore, as on the one hand policy, and on the other, a selfish appropriation of stolen property. The freemen were the soldiers, and the soldiers having conquered the land, were resolved that the chief captains and rulers should not have all, but that they would have a share; and as they were voters in making laws, they could accomplish their will.

And this was the origin and character of the Agrarian laws. 1. The lands were stolen. 2. They were not given to the poor people, but to the citizens, that is, in fact, the soldiers and the rulers of the state. 3. They were given to the citizens by themselves. The truth is, as I have stated it to be, *the poor*, both among the Romans and other nations, were utterly unprovided for. No such thing as provision for the poor appears ever to have been thought of among the Gentiles till Christianity began to exert its happy influence among them. The idea of improving and regenerating the human family originated with the religion of the Bible; the great and glorious plan never entered the human mind till the religion of heaven inspired it; and infidels are indebted to the Gospel for the very words—salvation, regeneration, &c.; the thoughts, the spirit, the language, and the deeds of benevolence have this sole origin, the religion of Heaven. 4. No one gave a pennyworth of his own in the affair. Where then is the charity of those Romans? The whole affair was nothing more than, 1. A robbery of the weak; and 2. A distribution of the plunder among the robbers. Suppose our government should go and conquer the French, and take from them half of their lands, and share those lands among the soldiers that fought the battles, and among the members of the House of Commons and their constituents; would you call this charity? Just such is the charity of the Agrarian laws, to which Lloyd Jones refers. (See Universal History, vol. xi. page 425, and xii. 403, &c.)

On page 112 we are told that among the Americans



there are persons who profess Christianity and yet hold men in slavery. And what does this prove? Not that Christianity causes slavery, but that some men act inconsistently, and that Christianity has not destroyed all the slavery in the world in one day. American slavery is dying, and it is Christianity alone that has given it its mortal wound. But a majority of a Methodist Conference voted against what is *called* abolition. What then? Did they do as Christianity taught them? Does Christianity speak against abolition? We can mention *hundreds* if not thousands of Conferences that have voted *for* abolition, and which were taught to vote for the abolition by the Gospel.

We have then a tale from Horton James about a missionary riding on the backs of four black men, when there were horses plenty to ride on. This whole tale carries the marks of falsehood on its very face. Why should a missionary prefer riding on four men's backs to riding on a horse? The story about the population dwindling to *almost nothing*, is contradicted by every one that has visited them for many years past. Some of the South Sea islanders degenerated, I have no doubt, after their discovery, in consequence of the introduction of intoxicating drinks by ungodly and unchristian men; but since the visits of missionaries they have improved in all respects, and intoxicating drinks are excluded from their islands. The whole story about Horton James is a fabrication. But if it were true, would it prove any thing against Christianity? A missionary might be carried on the backs of four black men without any harm. So thankful are the South Sea islanders for the blessings of Christianity, that many of them would not only carry them on their backs, if needful, but even risk their lives for their sakes. When J. Williams happened to intimate to a chief of the Navigators' Islands, that he was tired, he was unexpectedly lifted off the ground instantly, and borne along the crowd with delight; and so anxious were the natives to testify their respect to him, that those who could not get hold of a leg or an arm, pressed round him to support his body with their fingers. Perhaps Horton

James saw something like this, and was vexed, as many an infidel voyager has since been, to find the missionaries so much beloved, and the people so much improved that they cannot persuade them to join with them in sensuality and crime.

But one of the Social missionaries at Leamington had to fly through the window of the room where he was lecturing, says Lloyd Jones. I do not wonder at it. No one could hear a lecturer denouncing marriage, recommending universal and unrestrained prostitution, and other horrors and abominations of infidel Socialism, without excitement; and when people have learned enough of Christianity to be shocked at debauchery, and not enough to imitate the meekness of Christ, they would naturally enough make something to do when they heard for the first time the monstrous and unnatural doctrines of Socialism. And then again, the lecturer was perhaps afraid before he was hurt, like his brother Voltaire. "The wicked flee when no one pursueth; but the righteous are bold as a lion." It is very possible that the lecturer might run out at the window, but did any body run after him? And if any people did run after him, was it the Gospel that sent them?

But I once spoke strongly against Voltaire, therefore Christianity is an uncharitable system, argues Lloyd Jones, page 115. When will Lloyd Jones have done with such arguments? I might just as well say, the trees in my garden are not as big as it is possible for them to be, therefore the soil in which they grow is bad; or my children are not yet full grown men and women, therefore the food which they eat is poison, and there is no such thing as health in the world. What reasoning this would be thought, and yet this is the staple logic of my opponent. Because I once in seventeen years wrote a strong though true expression of a man who laboured to murder the hopes and joys of the world, therefore Christianity is a wicked system. Alas for infidelity, if these are its props! All hail, Christianity, if these are the worst weapons that thine enemies can wield against thee!

But I have referred to things without a date, says Lloyd

Jones, and have given no proofs of the beneficial influence of Christianity.

I answer, This is not true ; in many cases I have given dates ; and in all cases the dates *can* be given. If dates and authorities are wanted, I refer to "Ryan's History of the beneficial Effects of Christianity," to "Bishop Porteus on the Effects of Christianity," to "Cave's Primitive Christianity," to the histories of Methodism, to "Dymond's Essays on Morality," to "Clarkson's Portraiture of Quakerism," to "Williams's Missionary Enterprise in the South Seas," to the "History of the Moravian Missions," and to the histories of Missions and of the Church generally. From Williams's work I will give a few extracts, which will tend to show in what manner the Gospel has operated on the islands of the South Seas, and in what way it must operate on all countries where it is sincerely and generally received and reduced to practice.

"The natives of the South Seas were proverbial for their intellectual degradation and their cruel and ferocious habits, and yet, since the introduction of Christianity among them, their intellectual and moral character is entirely changed, and the people who used to be the terror or horror of mankind, are now become the objects of general admiration. There are the Tahitian and Society Islands,—the Sandwich Island group,—the Austral Islands,—the Panmolu, the Gambier, and the Marquesan Isles,—together with the Harvey, the Navigators' and the Friendly Islands, the greater part of the population of which have abandoned idolatry, with all its barbarous practices, its horrid rites, and superstitious customs. Their sanguinary wars have ceased ; their altars are no more stained with the blood of human beings, offered up in sacrifice ; and mothers have ceased to destroy their innocent babes." (Missionary Enterprise in the South Sea Islands, by John Williams, p. 9.)

But the habits and character of the inhabitants of those islands, previous to the introduction of Christianity, and the happy change which Christianity has produced, may be learned from a few facts:—"I

visited Hervey's Island in 1823, intending to place a native teacher there, as I expected to find a considerable population there; but on learning that, by their frequent and exterminating wars, they had reduced themselves to about sixty in number, I did not fulfil my intention. Some six or seven years after this I visited the same island again, and found that this miserable remnant of the former population had fought so frequently and desperately, that the only survivors were five men, three women, and a few children, and at that period there was a contention among them as to which should be king.

"Mauke is a small low island, discovered by myself and Mr. Bourne, in 1823. It is about fifteen miles in circumference. By an invasion of a large fleet of canoes, laden with warriors from a neighbouring island, about three years prior to our arrival, the population, previously considerable, was, by the dreadful massacre that ensued, reduced to about three hundred. Mitiaro is a still smaller island, of the same description. By famine and invasion this island has likewise been almost depopulated, there not being one hundred persons remaining." (Williams's *Missionary Enterprise*, page 17.) By the influence of Christianity those desolating wars have entirely ceased, and the inhabitants neither slaughter one another, nor live in fear of murderous invaders from their neighbouring islanders.

Rurutu was an island of savages, but behold the change effected there by the Gospel. "Some time after the introduction of Christianity into Rurutu, Captain Chase, who commanded an American whaler, and who was in the habit of touching frequently at Raiatea for refreshment, determined, on his last visit to us, to call at Rurutu, on his way to America, in order to procure a supply of yams, when, unfortunately, his vessel was wrecked upon the rocks. The natives, who would formerly have devoured the wrecked mariners and plundered the wreck, now, under the influence of those better principles which the Gospel had taught them, afforded the crew all the assistance in their power, from the moment the ship struck upon the rocks. When landing

things from the ship, they were put into the hands of the natives, and carried up to the native mission house, a distance of half a mile, and not a single article of clothing was taken from any man belonging to the ship, though they had it in their power to have plundered them of every thing that was landed. While the captain and his crew remained on shore themselves, the natives treated them with the utmost kindness, and did their utmost to make them comfortable."

This island was visited by D. Tyerman and G. Bennet, some time after the introduction of the Gospel. They saw in every direction the pleasing effects of the religion of Christ. The people were decently clothed and living in neat-looking white houses, and were blessed with plenty and peace. In the place of worship they were struck with the orderly behaviour of the people, as well as with some signal trophies of the word of God. "These were spears," as they observe, "not indeed beaten into pruning-hooks, but converted into staves to support the balustrade of the pulpit staircase; for the people here learn war no more, but all, submitting to the Prince of Peace, have cast away their instruments of cruelty and their idols together. So great a change effected in so short a time is almost beyond credibility; but we witnessed it with our own eyes." (Williams's Missionary Enterprise, &c. p. 45—50.)

Speaking of Aitutaki, another island, John Williams says, after he had witnessed the happy changes produced among the natives by the Gospel—"Little did I expect to see so much accomplished in so short a time. Eighteen months ago they were the wildest people I had ever witnessed; now they had become mild and docile, diligent and kind." Next day he preached to from fifteen hundred to two thousand people, just emerged from heathenism. "Many of them were dressed very neatly, and I could not help contrasting their appearance with that which they presented on their first visit. At that time they were constantly killing and even eating each other, for they were cannibals; but now they were all, with one accord, bending their knees together in the worship of

the God of peace and love." Mr. Bourne visited this island some time after; he says, speaking of the natives, women as well as men—"They are diligent in learning, and numbers can read. Family and private prayer is very general. Every thing has remained quiet since our last visit: neither war nor rumour of war has been seen or heard, although formerly it was their greatest delight, and the bodies of their slain enemies formed the horrible repast at the conclusion of every engagement." (Williams's *Missionary Enterprise*, p. 61, 62, 111.)

"When Raratonga was first visited, the people were found sunk in the grossest licentiousness, and addicted to the most ferocious and savage practices: but the Gospel raised them to purity, and taught them lessons and habits of affection and charity. While they were heathens, as soon as a son reached manhood, he would fight and wrestle with his father for the mastery, and, if he obtained it, he would take forcible possession of the farm previously belonging to his parent, and drive his parent in a state of destitution from his home. The Gospel taught the son affection for his parents.

"When a wife was bereft of her husband by death, the relations of the husband, instead of paying the visit of mercy and kindness to the fatherless and widow in their affliction, would seize every article of value belonging to the deceased, turn the disconsolate mother and her fatherless offspring away, and take possession of the house, the food, and the land. The Gospel taught then kindness to the afflicted." (*Missionary Enterprise*, p. 137, 138.)

"Between each district was left a space of uncultivated land, about half a mile in width, on which their battles were most frequently fought; but since the introduction of Christianity, many of those wastes have been cultivated. Their wars were exceedingly frequent, and the sad effects of them were every where apparent. There is not an old cocoa-nut tree to be seen on the north-west or south sides of the island. A few old bread-fruit trees still rear their lonely heads, having survived the injuries they had received from the hands of the desolating conquerors.

"Walking one day with the king among the groves of

banana and bread-fruit trees, and observing the mutilations, I asked him, while pointing to one of them, why all the bark was stripped off; and turning to another, I asked why so deep a gash was made in it; and I expressed a wish to know what had become of the cocoa-nut trees, against the stumps of which we were continually striking our feet. To this he replied, 'You know very well we were conquered, and why do you banter me? We were fools enough to fight with the trees as well as with the men; some we cut down ourselves, lest the enemies should eat the fruit of them, and others our conquerors destroyed. If it was possible, I would put new bark on all the trees, and fill up the gashes in the trunks of the others; for wherever I go, they stare me in the face, and remind me of my defeat. However, young trees are growing fast, and I am planting cocoa-nuts in all directions; so that my possessions will soon be as valuable as those of our conquerors; and I am under no apprehension of having them destroyed again,—for the Gospel has put an end to our wars.' (Williams's *Missionary Enterprise*, p. 208, 209.)

"Female prisoners were very frequently put to death, the poor little children had spears passed through their ears, and were carried in triumph to the *maræ*, and other cruelties more horrible still were practised, but all of them were swept away by the Gospel of Christ.

"At Raratonga the females were treated as inferiors. They were not allowed the same kinds of food as the men, nor were they allowed to dwell under the same roof with their tyrannical masters; but were compelled to eat their scanty meal, of inferior provisions, at a distance, while their husbands feasted on the 'fat of the land,' and the 'the abundance of the sea.' The Gospel changed the state of things entirely, teaching the husbands respect and tenderness, and rendering the wives abundant in their affectionate attentions. During the sickness which prevailed shortly after our arrival, we were delighted at beholding the tender sympathy and unremitting attentions which the women showed towards their husbands. Enter their habitations when we would, by

night or by day, the head of the afflicted husband was in the lap of his affectionate wife; while she beat off the annoying flies, bathed the temples with water, or eased the pain by the gentle pressure of the afflicted part with her soft hands. Thus, in those places which so lately were the abodes of savage and implacable furies, the inhabitants now reside with their beloved teachers, sitting under their bread-fruit and banana groves, no one making them afraid." (Missionary Enterprise, p. 209—214.)

"It was a general practice among the inhabitants of the South Sea Islands to murder their own children, but the horrible practice was quickly abolished by the Gospel. 'Let us this afternoon remember our former state,' said one of the native converts at a public meeting, 'how many children were killed, and how few were kept alive; but now none are destroyed. Parents now behold their three, five, and even their ten children; the majority of which would have been murdered, had not God sent his word to us. Now hundreds of these are daily taught the word of God.'

"Another native rose and said—'There were two captivities amongst us formerly. The one was a captivity to the gods, the other was a captivity to the king's servants. Perhaps there is an individual present who understands the former captivity; for I know the very cave in which he hid himself several times, when he was sought after to be offered up to be sacrificed to the gods.\* The other captivity was to the servants of our chiefs. The master of the house would sit as a poor captive, without daring to speak, while they would seize his rolls of cloth, kill the fattest of his pigs, pluck the best of his bread fruit, and take the very posts of his house for fire-wood with which to cook them. Is there not a person present who buried his new canoe in the sand, to hide it from these desperate men? But now all these customs are abolished: we live in peace, without fear. But what has abolished them all? It is the Gospel of Jesus.'

"Prior to the introduction of Christianity, the old people, of both sexes, were treated with the greatest

\* This person was sitting at the time in front of the speaker.



cruelty; for as soon as they became burdensome, their friends, or their own children, relieved themselves from further trouble, by putting an end to their existence. Under the pretence of carrying the victim to a stream of water to bathe, his relations would hurl him into a hole previously dug for the purpose, and then throw a heap of stones upon the body. The Gospel taught them to respect their aged kindred, and now were seen numbers upwards of sixty years of age, collected into classes and learning the truths of religion, and enjoying its consolations. Thus various and numerous are the blessings of the Gospel, which it imparts with a liberal hand to people of all climes, and under all circumstances; the new-born infant, the hoary-headed man, the despised old woman, the widows and the fatherless, the afflicted and the dying, are alike the objects of its tender regards." (Missionary Enterprise, p. 287, 288.)

"We have a delightful instance of the beneficent power of the Gospel in the case of the chief Vara. In the times of their ignorance, he was a procurer of human sacrifices, and on one occasion Pomare sent to him an order to obtain one immediately. Vara was rather at a loss to satisfy this imperious demand; and as he was going in search of a victim, his own little brother followed him at a distance, and cried after him. So soon as he saw him he turned round, struck his head with a stone, killed him, and, having put him into a large basket, made of cocoa-nut leaves, sent him to Pomare. When his mother bewailed the death of her child, and charged him with cruelty for killing his brother, he abused her. Another office held by Vara was to rally dispirited warriors, and many a night has he walked from house to house, to rouse the savage spirit of the people. But this implacable and unmerciful heathen was converted by the Gospel, and became a humble, loving, and devoted Christian, and adorned his profession to the day of his death. When near his end, he was very happy, and gave earnest thanks to God for the salvation of the Gospel. 'I grieve,' said he, 'that all my children do not love the Saviour. Had they known the

misery we endured in the reign of the devil, they would gladly take 'the Gospel in exchange for their follies. Jesus is the best King; he gives a pillow without thorns.'

"A little time after, I asked him," says the missionary, "if he was afraid to die, when, with almost youthful energy he replied, 'No, no; the canoe is in the sea, the sails are spread, she is ready for the gale; I have a good pilot to guide me, and a good haven to receive me. My outside man and my inside man differ. Let the one rot till the trump shall sound, but let my soul wing her way to the throne of Jesus.' Thus can the Gospel calm the savage soul, and make the fierce and bloody, gentle and tender in their lives, and impart to their regenerated souls peace and exultation amidst the pains of death." (Missionary Enterprise, p. 365, 366.)

Many such pleasing instances of the saving and comforting power of the Gospel might be given, but our space does not permit us.—See other affecting instances on pages 368—370, and 374—376, Williams's Missionary Enterprise.

Makea, a converted chief of Raratonga, when on a visit to the Navigators' islands, gave the people an account of the introduction of the Gospel into his country, and of the effects it had produced. "Now," said he, "we enjoy happiness, to which our ancestors were strangers; our ferocious wars have ceased; our houses are the abodes of comfort; we have European property; we have books in our own language; our children can read; and above all, we know the true God, and the way of salvation by Jesus Christ." He concluded his address, by earnestly exhorting Malietoa and his brother chiefs to grasp with a firm hold the word of Jehovah; "for this alone," he added, "can make you a peaceable and happy people. I should have died a savage had it not been for the Gospel." Makea's address produced a most powerful impression. Malietoa embraced the Gospel, became a meek and loving follower of Jesus, and a happy and useful prince. Malietoa had a beloved daughter, who was barbarously murdered by another chief. His sons urged him to go to war against the murderer,

but he answered, "Having embraced the Gospel, which is a religion of *peace*, I am determined, if possible, to live under its influence." (428—439.)

It was a common thing in many of the South Sea Islands, to offer up human sacrifices. At the feast of Restoration no less than seven human victims were required. Human victims were invariably offered on the eve of war. Perhaps a correct idea of this dreadful system may be given by a short account of the last Tahitian victim that was sacrificed. Pomare was about to fight an important battle, and wishing to insure success, he sent two messengers in search of a victim. They went to the house of the man whom they had purposed to sacrifice, and asked the wife where her husband was. She told them, he was in such a place, planting bananas. "Well," they continued, "we are thirsty, give us some cocoa-nut water." She told them she had no nuts in the house, but that they were at liberty to climb the trees, and take as many as they desired. They then requested her to lend them the *O*, which is a long thick piece of iron wood, with which the natives open the cocoa-nut. She cheerfully complied with their wishes, imagining no harm. On receiving the *O*, the men left the house, and went in search of their victim; and the woman, having become rather suspicious, followed them shortly after, and reached the place where her husband was working, just in time to see the blow inflicted and her husband fall. She rushed forward towards her husband, but she was immediately seized and bound hand and foot, while the body of her murdered husband was placed in a long basket of cocoa-nut leaves, and borne from her sight. While the men were carrying their victim to the *marae*, he recovered from the stunning effects of the blow, and, bound as he was in the cocoa-nut leaf basket, he said to his murderers, "Friends, I know what you intend to do with me; you are about to kill me, and to offer me as a *tapu* to your savage gods; and I also know that it is useless to beg for mercy, for you will not spare my life. You may kill my body, but you cannot hurt my soul; for I have begun to pray to Jesus, the knowledge of whom

the missionaries have brought to our island." Instead of being moved to compassion by his affecting address, they laid him down upon the ground, placed a stone under his head, and, with another stone, beat it in pieces. In this state they carried him to their savage gods. "One of the assassins, whose business it was to procure human sacrifices, sailed with me in my last voyage," says J. Williams, "and not only confirmed the foregoing statement, but detailed many other transactions equally tragical, in which he had been engaged. But painful as the incident is, it is a relief to know, that this was the very last sacrifice offered to the gods of Tahiti; for very soon after, Christianity was generally embraced, and the altars of the savage gods were thrown down."

"Another circumstance," says Williams, "which rendered this practice still more dreadful, was, that as soon as one of the family had been selected for sacrifice, all the other male members of it were looked upon as devoted to the same horrid purpose. It would avail them nothing if they removed to another island, for the reason of their removal would soon be known there; and whenever a sacrifice was required, it would be sought amongst them. I had in my own service an individual who was the last of his family, of which every other male member had been offered in sacrifice, and he had been eight times hunted in the mountains with dogs, but being a cunning fellow, and an extraordinary runner, he had eluded his pursuers, until the inhabitants of his island embraced the Gospel, and human sacrifices were abolished. These very people," adds Williams, "who a few years ago were addicted to all these horrid practices, now sit in thousands in places of Christian worship, erected by themselves, clothed, and in their right mind, and listening with intense interest to the truths of the Gospel. A spectacle more truly sublime it is scarcely possible for the human mind to contemplate."

The murder of infants was another practice which prevailed among the Tahitian and Society Islands, to an extent almost exceeding credibility. "I never conversed with a female of those islands, that had borne

children, prior to the introduction of Christianity," says Williams, "who had not destroyed some of them, and frequently as many as from five to ten. During the visit of the deputation, our respected friend G. Bennett was our guest for three or four months; and on one occasion, while conversing on this subject, he expressed a wish to obtain accurate knowledge of the extent to which this cruel system had prevailed. Three women were sitting in the room at the time, making European garments, under Mrs. Williams's direction; and after replying to Mr. Bennett's inquiries, I said, 'I have no doubt but that each of these women has destroyed some of her children.' Looking at them with an expression of surprise and incredulity, Mr. Bennett exclaimed, 'Impossible! Such motherly respectable-looking women could never have been guilty of so great an atrocity.' 'Well,' I added, 'we'll ask them.' Addressing the first, I said to her, 'Friend, how many children have you destroyed?' She was startled at my question, and at first charged me with unkindness, in harrowing up her feelings by bringing the destruction of her babes to her remembrance; but upon hearing the object of my inquiry, she replied, with a faltering voice, 'I have destroyed *nine*.' The second, with eyes suffused with tears, said, 'I have destroyed *seven*;' and the third informed us that she had destroyed *five*. Thus, three individuals, casually selected, had killed one and twenty children! But I am happy to add, that these mothers were, at the time of this conversation, and continued to be, so long as I knew them, consistent members of my church.

"On another occasion I was called to visit the wife of a chief in dying circumstances. She had professed Christianity for many years, had learned to read when nearly sixty, and was a very active teacher in an adult school. In the prospect of death, she sent a pressing request that I would visit her immediately, and on entering her apartment, she exclaimed, 'O, servant of God! come and tell me what I must do!' Perceiving that she was suffering great mental distress, I inquired the cause of it; when she replied, 'I am about to die, I am

about to die.' 'Well,' I rejoined, 'if it be so, what creates this agony of mind?' 'Oh, my sins, my sins,' she cried; 'I am about to die.' I then inquired what particular sins they were which so greatly disturbed her, when she exclaimed, 'Oh, my children, my murdered children! I am about to die, and I shall meet them all at the judgment seat of Christ.' Upon this I inquired how many children she had destroyed; and, to my astonishment, she replied, 'I have destroyed *sixteen*! and now I am about to die.' As soon as my feelings would allow me, I began to reason with her, and urged the consideration that she had done this when a heathen, and during 'the times of ignorance, which God winked at;' but this did not afford her the desired consolation; and again she gave vent to her agonized feelings by exclaiming, 'Oh, my children, my children!' I then directed her to the faithful saying which is worthy of all acceptance, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners. This imparted some comfort; and after visiting her frequently, and urging upon her mind the consolations of the Gospel, her troubled spirit was tranquillized, and she died about eight days after my first visit, in the hope of salvation."

"Frequently have our feelings been most powerfully excited, at the examination of our school-children; and scenes more affecting than some which have been witnessed on such occasions it is scarcely possible to conceive. One of these, which occurred at my own station at Raiatea, I will briefly describe. Upwards of six hundred children were present. A feast was prepared, and they walked through the settlement in procession, most of them dressed in European garments, with little hats and banners made by those very parents who, had not Christianity come to their rescue, would have destroyed the little creatures. The children added much to the interest of the day, by preparing flags with such mottos as the following: 'What a blessing the Gospel is!' 'The Christians of England sent us the Gospel.' 'Had it not been for the Gospel, we should have been destroyed as soon as we were born.' On some, texts of Scripture were inscribed—'Behold,

the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world.' 'Suffer little children to come unto me;' and other similar passages. After proceeding through the settlement, they were conducted to the spacious chapel, and sung the Jubilee hymn. The venerable old king then took the chair. He had been worshipped as a god, and had led fierce warriors to the battle and the fight, but he evidently felt that he had never occupied a station so delightful or so honourable as that of presiding at this examination of the children of his people. The children were placed in the centre, and the parents occupied the other seats. Each class was then called up and examined, and after this, individuals from the different classes were selected, and questioned by the missionary. While this was proceeding, the appearance of the parents was most affecting. The eyes of some were gleaming with delight, as the father said to the mother, or the mother to the father, 'What a mercy it is that we spared our dear girl!' Others, with saddened countenances and faltering voices, lamented in bitterness that they had not saved theirs; and the silent tear, as it stole down the cheeks of many, told the painful tale that *all* their children had been destroyed. In the midst of our proceedings, a venerable chieftain, grey with age, arose, and with impassioned look and manner, exclaimed, 'Let me speak; I must speak!' On obtaining permission, he proceeded thus:—'Oh that I had known that the Gospel was coming! Oh that I had known that these blessings were in store for us; then I should have saved my children, and they would have been among this happy group, repeating these precious truths; but, alas! I destroyed them all, I have not *one* left.' This chief was an *arioi* of the highest rank, and the laws of his class required the destruction of all his children. Turning to the chairman, who was also a relative of the chief, he stretched out his arm and exclaimed, 'You, my brother, saw me kill child after child, but you never seized this murderous hand, and said, Stay brother, God is about to bless us; the Gospel of salvation is coming to our shores! Then he cursed the gods which he had formerly worshipped, and added, 'It was you that infused this savage disposition

into us, and now I shall die childless, although I have been the father of nineteen children.' After this he sat down, and in a flood of tears gave vent to his agonized feelings."

"This scene occurred in my own place of worship," says J. Williams. "I saw the man, and heard him utter these expressions. Many other instances equally affecting might be added, but I shall content myself with mentioning but one more. This related to a chief woman, who had been united in marriage to a man of inferior rank; and it was the universal custom to destroy the children of such a union. The first babe was born and put to death. The father wished the second to be spared, but the mother and the mother's relatives demanded its destruction. The third was a fine girl. The father pleaded and entreated that it might be saved, for his bowels yearned over it, but the mother and the mother's relatives again carried their point, and the babe was doomed to die. One of the numerous modes of killing children was, to put the babe into a hole covered with a plank, to keep the earth from pressing it, and to leave it there to perish. This method was adopted in the present case. The father happened to be in the mountains at the time of the child's interment; but on his return he hastened to the spot, opened the grave, and finding that the babe was not dead, he took her up, and gave her in charge to his brother and sister, by whom she was conveyed to the island of Aimeo, about seventy miles distant, and there they brought her up. The husband died, without having informed his wife that their daughter was still alive. After Christianity was introduced, the mother was on one occasion bewailing most bitterly the destruction of her children; when a woman who was present, and who knew what the father had done, told her that her daughter had been saved, and that she was yet living at Aimeo. A short time after receiving this intelligence she sailed to Aimeo, and on reaching the shore, she hurried with excited feelings to the house of her relatives, and as she approached it, beheld with wonder and delight a fine young girl standing in the door-way. She at once recognized her own



image in the countenance of the girl. It was her daughter. She clasped her to her bosom, but no one can describe her transport of joy. The mother is gone to her rest, but her daughter is, at the present time, an active teacher in our schools, and a consistent member of a Christian Church." (Williams's *Missionary Enterprise in the South Seas*, p. 557, &c.)

Many other interesting facts, of a similar kind, are given in this work, all tending to illustrate the happy influence of the religion of Christ. Great numbers of similar facts might be quoted from the histories of the Moravian, and from the histories of Methodist missions, in various parts of the world. The histories of Christian Missions abound with such pleasing facts, demonstrating the truth of the great principle which I undertook to prove, That the religion of Christ, wherever it is received and practised, produces good, and good of every kind.

I may also observe, that the influence of Christianity at its first promulgation was the same as it is at the present day. It would be easy to fill five or six hundred pages with accounts of its benevolent and happy effects both on individuals and nations; and in a separate work I shall furnish some of these accounts; but the limits of this Appendix will not allow me to do it here. I might begin with the Saviour himself, go down to the first churches who used their property as common, supplying the needs of every member. I might tell of Dorcas, whose employment was making garments for the poor, and other works of charity; and of multitudes of others, who by their charity astonished the world, and made their enemies to exclaim, "See how these Christians love one another!" I might tell of Pamphilius, who, amongst other instances of his charity, expended immense sums in circulating copies of the sacred volume,—of Chrysostom, who out of his own purse supported many teachers of the Gospel to instruct and convert the Gentiles,—of men who exposed themselves to hazards and hardships innumerable to enlighten and bless the dark nations of the earth,—and of some who sub-

mitted to be slaves, to obtain the opportunity of instructing slaves. I might show how the churches provided for their poor, and for the poor of their persecutors,—how they took up outcast children which the Gentiles had exposed to death, and trained them as their own offspring,—how the church at Antioch helped strangers, provided for lepers, redeemed slaves, and daily maintained three thousand helpless widows and maids. I might mention Cyprian, who sold his estates to relieve the wants of others,—how he left his house open for all that were needy,—how he was eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame, and the helper of all that were in distress. I might make mention of Cæsarius, who made only this short will, “I will that my estates be given to the poor,”—of the father of Nazianzen, who not only bestowed the surplus of his estate upon the poor, but even part of what he reserved for necessary uses,—of his mother, whose benevolence would have exhausted an ocean of wealth,—of his sister Gorgonia, who was as the mother of orphans, and whose estate was as common to the poor as to herself,—of Epiphanius, bishop of Salamone, who spent all his estate in relieving the needy, and such as were shipwrecked and cast upon the coast, and then freely dispensed in works of mercy the treasures of the church. I might tell of Fabiola, a Roman lady of high rank and great wealth, who sold her estate and dedicated the money to the use of the poor,—who built an hospital, (the first that ever was built) in which she maintained and cured the infirm and miserable, or any sick that she met with in the streets,—who attended helpless and afflicted creatures, which she had collected together by hundreds, in her own person, carrying them sometimes in her arms, sometimes washing and dressing their sores, and at other times preparing food and giving them physic with her own hand. I might mention Placilla the empress, who made the lame and the wounded her care, would go home to their houses, carry them all necessary conveniences, attend and assist them, not by the ministry of her servants and followers only, but with her own hands,—who visited the common hospitals, attended at

sick beds for their cure, tasted their broths, prepared their bread, reached them their provisions, washed their cups with her own hands, and performed all other offices which fell to the meanest of the servants. I might tell of Deogratias, the aged bishop of Carthage, who provided for the needy, took care of the sick,—of the Christians of Alexandria, and of others who nobly sacrificed and ventured all for the welfare of their needy and afflicted brethren. I might tell of Cyprian's efforts for the redemption of captives, giving thousands of crowns at a time for that good work,—of Acasius and his church, who ransomed seven thousand Persians at one time at an immense expense, fed them and sent them to their homes,—of Paulinus, bishop of Nola, who himself became a slave to ransom a widow's son. I might tell of their plainness of dress, their rejection of ornaments and gay attire, their temperance in meats and drinks, their patience under insults and persecution, their constancy and perseverance, and give remarkable and many instances of these virtues, all tending to supply the resources, and give efficiency to their plans of charity. Whole books might be written on this subject, as well as on the endless institutions of charity to which Christians of modern times have given being, and the prodigies of benevolence to be found in the lives of such men as Howard, Boyle, Gouge, Penn, Fox, Wesley, Whitfield, Hanway, Eddy, Franck, and many more, as well as of many religious bodies, all furnishing floods of evidence of the beneficent tendency of the Gospel, and proving that wherever it is reduced to practice it makes all things new. And of all these things I could give dates and names, and the attestation of authentic and creditable history. But I must stop and reserve the particulars for another pamphlet. This pamphlet or little volume will probably be published in February or March, not long after the publication of the Discussion. The title of the work will be, "The Gospel Triumphant," &c. In this work I shall give the arguments in favour of the happy influence of Christianity at greater length than I have been able to do in this discussion, as well as unfold the atheistical and licentious character of the Social system of Robert Owen. The work will be published by Groombridge, and may be had of any bookseller.

I shall now conclude this Appendix by briefly giving

he substance of what I have proved in the preceding pages, and by a few words of advice to my readers:—

1. I have proved that the passages quoted by Lloyd Jones do not sanction persecution, but that they simply require the churches to keep themselves apart from corrupt and infidel characters; and I may now add, that the judgment which fell on Elymas was not inflicted by Paul, but by God himself, and that the infliction was merely *announced* by Paul.—(See the passage, Acts xiii.)

2. I have proved that the Gospel is a system of liberty throughout; that it does not forbid free inquiry, but commands it; that it requires no blind faith, but such faith only as has truth and proper evidence to rest upon.

3. I have proved that Lloyd Jones's accounts of the proceedings of the early Christians, and of professing Christians generally, are awfully incorrect, abounding with the most shameful misrepresentations.

4. I have shown, that the persecutions of persons calling themselves Christians, did not originate in the influence of Christianity, but in the *want* of it; that the principal persecutors did not even profess to follow the New Testament alone. I have also proved,—

5. That Christ never once taught persecution, or any thing of a persecuting tendency; but that he forbade persecution, and taught meekness, mercy, charity, and truth, in scores of passages.

6. That Christ never practised persecution. He was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He prayed for his murderers.

7. The Apostles and first Christians did not teach or practise persecution, but on the contrary, endured the persecution of their enemies with unconquerable meekness.—(See Death of Stephen, Lives of the Apostles, and the whole New Testament.)

8. Those sects, now-a-days, that pay most regard to the precepts of the New Testament, are farthest from persecution, as the Quakers, Dissenting Churches, &c.

9. Those sects which read and regard the New Testament least, or profess to follow other guides, are most forward to persecute, as the Roman Catholics, &c.

10. Those ages when the New Testament was least understood were the bloodiest ages; while in those times in which it has been most read, persecution has in proportion gone out of use.

11. Those nations where the New Testament is least known at this day, are the most fierce and intolerant; while in those nations in which the New Testament is generally read,—“the day,” as Lloyd Jones observed, “when men could not stand forth to declare their principles without fear of pains and penalties,” has passed away.

12. Persecution is practised in every nation where the Gospel is at present unknown.

13. Persecution was the law and practice of all the Gentile nations before the coming of Christ.

14. The first law in favour of toleration ever heard of, was passed by Constantine, the first emperor that ever professed Christianity.

15. The bloodiest persecutions were those of the Pagans and the Popedom against Christians; and those of the infidel philosophers and politicians of France, of Robert Owen's persuasion, against all who refused to turn atheists.

16. Diderot, the modern father of Socialism, was a persecutor, so was D'Alembert, his colleague, and the Socialist infidels generally.

17. All men are persecutors by nature, and nothing but Christianity can take the persecuting spirit out of man.

18. No man can be found who was free from intolerance before he became a Christian, and was made a persecutor by becoming a Christian.

19. The Socialists are persecutors, as I proved from their own works, providing hospitals or dungeons for one another, and preparing to force the rest of mankind to renounce religion and turn Socialists, at the point of the sword and the mouth of the musket.

20. Professing Christians that persecuted, were persecutors before they became professors. They did not find persecution in Christianity, they brought it into the church with them.

21. The first and best writers against persecution were Christians, such as Milton, Taylor, Locke, &c.

22. The men that broke the power of persecution in England and America were professing Christians, Dissenters, Quakers, Methodists, &c.

23. All sects become more and more tolerant, in proportion as they advance in the knowledge and obedience of the Gospel.

24. The most tolerant of all sects are the greatest lovers of the Gospel.

These and some other arguments I used, not one of which my opponent so much as attempted to answer. He simply went on reading bloody stories, never desisting except to wrest my words, throw out some sneer, or utter some startling and horrible blasphemy. This was the work of the first night.

The second night the question was, "Whether Christianity does not produce good, wherever it operates, and good of every kind?" This point I proved by the following arguments:—

1. From the nature of its doctrines, precepts, and examples, it is manifest that it cannot produce any thing else but good. It forbids all crimes, the fountains of all misery; and enjoins all virtues, the fountains of peace and joy.

2. The whole history of Christianity proves it to have been productive of good wherever it was reduced to practice.—As to particulars, I showed that wherever Christianity prevailed—

1. It shook to pieces the prevailing systems of idolatry, with all their cruel, intemperate, and unclean rites, and established the pure and spiritual worship of the one true God.

2. It struck at the root of all superstition, destroyed magic, witchcraft, astrology, necromancy, &c., and brought men to rest in peace under the providence of one great and wise and merciful Deity.

3. It overturned all systems of priestcraft, and made men free in soul.

4. It made men peaceful, forbad and exterminated war.

5. Broke down the partition walls of opposing nations, castes, and tribes, and united men of all nations, ranks, and castes, in one family of truth and charity.

6. Cured the evils of domestic life; raised woman from slavery to be man's friend and equal; ended the cruel rigors of paternal authority; and made for its disciples happy homes.

7. It made men valiant in the cause of truth and mercy, abolished fraud, lying, oppression, and robbery.

8. It made men benevolent, and formed its converts into friends and benefactors of all mankind.

9. It extended the bounds of human liberty, softening the rigors of slavery, and gradually causing systems of slavery to pass entirely away.

These points I proved from the New Testament, from

the works of the Fathers, from the Ecclesiastical historians, from the testimonies of Pagan writers, and from the testimonies of our enemies ; from the history of England, from the history of Missions, and from the character of religious communities now existing.

I then came to prove that it produced good of every kind. Here I read over an account of the requisites for human happiness as laid down in one of the Socialists' standard books, and showed that the tendency of Christianity was to give all these requisites to men

As far as my limited time would allow, I showed—

1. That the tendency of Christianity was, by promoting temperance, chastity, and the due exercise of the bodily and mental powers, to improve the health and vigor of the whole physical and intellectual system, both of the present and future generations.

2. That it extended man's power over the elements, increased his ability to procure food, and to obtain all the necessities and enjoyments of life.

3. That it made the right education of children the duty of all parents, and enjoined Christians to seek the instruction and improvement of the whole species.

4. That it awakened in every heart that yielded to its influence, a desire to do good to all mankind, and that it furnished even its humblest converts with some means of contributing to the welfare of their fellow men.

5. That it tended to beget in the minds of men a desire after knowledge, and led them to such pursuits as were likely to add to their intellectual stock. That education and science trod in the steps of piety, and that Bacon, and Boyle, and Newton, and Locke, and Clarke, and Berkley, and Baxter, and Milton, were but examples of what it was able to do for all mankind.

6. That it improved all our social pleasures, purifying our souls and uniting us together by heavenly and holy sympathies ; forming a spiritual kingdom upon earth, and fitting us by godly intercourse for the society of heaven.

7. That it favoured the progress of all useful arts, extending man's dominion over all material things, and placing in man's reach all the riches of the universe.

8. That it delivered its disciples from superstition, from supernatural fears, such as the fear of sorcerers and demons, teaching us to rest in the hands of Him who numbers the hairs of our heads ;—that it takes away

the fear of death, so that the Christian neither dreads the horrible phantoms of the Pagans, nor the revolting and appalling annihilation of thought, of feeling, of hope and consciousness of the infidel;—that it gives, moreover, a glorious hope of immortality.

9. That it promotes liberty,—liberty of soul, liberty of body, thus emancipating and unfettering the universe.

I was proceeding with this point, when I was told the time was nearly gone. I was, in fact, unable, in consequence of want of time, to bring forward more than one-third of what I was wishful to say.

Lloyd Jones went on reading his tales of blood and murder. He never fairly met one single argument, or offered one single valid objection. I may observe, in conclusion, that Lloyd Jones, in his last speech, gave up the whole point in dispute, and acknowledged that all the evils of persecution of which he had been reading, were produced through the mistakes of men.

The objections that Lloyd Jones made the second night were—

1. That priestcraft, superstition, &c. were not yet all abolished; which nobody of course denied. All I had to prove was, that Christianity destroyed these evils wherever it was properly received and reduced to practice, and this I did prove. Lloyd Jones's objection only proved, what all of us knew, that all had not heartily embraced Christianity, and that therefore Christianity had not yet finished its work.

2. Another objection was, that philosophy had done the good I spoke about. This of course was not denied: the philosophy of Christ, the only philosophy that was ever worth the name, had, under the blessing of its Author, done it all. What Pagan or Infidel philosophy can do, I have shewn in this Appendix.

My Christian friends, you will see from this debate, that the inconsistencies of professors are the whole strength of infidelity. "Infidelity," says one, "is a monster bred amidst the stagnant waters of a corrupted Christianity;" and we may add, that the food on which this monster lives, and from which it derives its strength, is, the remaining imperfections and corruptions of professors of Christianity of the present day. It should therefore be the endeavour of every friend to religion, to free himself from every thing, both in his doctrine and in his



character, that is at variance with the religion of Christ. This is the only way by which we can thoroughly overthrow the schemes of infidels. Let us, then, as the Apostle exhorts, "by well doing put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." This will deprive the monster of its food, and bring its existence to a speedy close. This will shame infidelity out of the world, and bring back many of those who have been unhappily led astray by the craftiness of its advocates, to the ways of peace and happiness. I know we cannot prevent insincere persons from taking upon themselves the Christian name, but let us use our best endeavours to be free from blame ourselves, and to keep as free as possible from faithless persons, and the power of the Gospel will wax greater and greater, and every form of licentiousness and unbelief will be driven from the abodes of men. The wonders which Christianity has already accomplished, leave us no room to doubt of its final triumph. The Gospel has been sent forth to regenerate the whole family of man, and it will not return to Him that sent it till it has accomplished its glorious object. All lands shall hear its glad tidings; all hearts shall feel its saving power; and all the tribes of earth shall exult together in the fulness and the glory of its blessings. Earth and heaven shall sing together, with their millions of united voices—"Glory to God in the Highest, on earth peace, good-will towards men."

---

Lloyd Jones is to add a second Appendix to this Discussion; which I am not to be permitted to see or to answer till after the Discussion is published. This does not look very much like a love of truth, or a love of full and free discussion. What sort of statements they are which Lloyd Jones is so afraid of being answered, I do not know, but I shall have the opportunity of seeing them when they are published, and I shall also answer them in "The Gospel Triumphant."

[By Mr. LLOYD JONES.—Reply to Mr. Barker.] M

Glasgow, October 28, 1839. M

Some explanation may be required as to the reason why our Appendixes should have taken the form of replies, instead of being, as they should be, remarks on the Discussion and the incidental occurrences arising out of it.

It will no doubt be recollected that this Discussion was preceded by a long and unpleasant correspondence, and that subsequent to its occurrence there was a good deal of angry altercation, as to the correcting of the speeches of Mr. Barker, which has ultimately led to a long and unprofitable delay in publishing the Report. During the transaction of these matters, Mr. Barker (who publishes weekly a periodical called the "Evangelical Reformer,") took the advantage afforded him by such publication, to represent my character in a most discreditable light, to which representations I of course had no opportunity of offering anything in reply. Up, therefore, to the writing of the Appendixes, Mr. B. had every thing his own way.

Mr. B. furnished his Appendix to the printer first, and the printer informed me that he had entirely confined himself to the discussion.\* The reason why he made no reference in his Appendix to the disagreeable incidents growing out of the Discussion, I cannot say, unless it be, that he had said every thing he could say, in his *Evangelical Reformer*, so that *his* readers were in possession of his version of the affair; and he must have also known that our friends, who occasionally read his *Evangelical Reformer*, could not place any, even the least, reliance upon any thing that *he* might say, in consequence of the manner in which he had belied them and their principles. He had nothing to do, therefore, but to endeavour, by resuming the argument, to make up for the deficiencies he exhibited during the Discussion.

I, however, was placed in a different position. I had no opportunity of replying to the calumnies published in his *Evangelical Reformer*, and I therefore felt it my duty to endeavour to set myself right with the public in my Appendix. This I did; but when I presented it to the printer, he suggested the propriety of submitting it to

\* His original Appendix commenced with his remarks on my speeches, and was written prior to my first Appendix. The preceding part of his Appendix is, as will be perceived, a reply to my Appendix, and is, in reality, a second Appendix, and was written subsequent to the last part.

Mr. B., as it contained certain statements which placed his character in a very questionable light. This, after some hesitation, I consented to do; whereupon Mr. B. claimed the right of reply; this was granted, upon the condition that I should write a rejoinder, which I now submit.\* I am charged in Mr. Barker's reply—

1. With a desire to turn attention from the point in dispute, by turning the matter into a personal quarrel. I repudiate such intention altogether; I have only endeavoured to clear myself from the personal charges made against me by Mr. B. in his *Evangelical Reformer*; and having no other mode of doing it by which *his readers* would see it, I felt justified in adopting the manner complained of. This, then, was the reason, and not the one alleged by Mr. B. And I would further add, that such a charge comes with a bad grace from Mr. Barker, after he had rendered such course necessary by his foul attacks in his *Evangelical Reformer*.

2. Mr. Barker states that my charges are false, but he has not time to reply to them fully, which excuse may no doubt satisfy some of Mr. B.'s readers, but it certainly cannot satisfy those who look for something more than the priestly robe as a guarantee for truth-telling.

3. He says it is true he re-wrote his speeches, because he found it difficult to make his corrections on the small slips of paper upon which the Reporter had furnished the report. No doubt he found it difficult to do so, when he found it necessary to add as much more, within a few words, as the Reporter furnished. *The small slips of paper did not inconvenience me.*

4. He gives the Reporter's opinion as to the nature of his alterations. First, I would say that I could not allow the opinion of the Reporter to reason me out of my conviction of the unfairness of the alterations which I have exposed; secondly, I cannot tell what parts of his speeches he took to the Reporter for the purpose of receiving an opinion thereon. I am, however, persuaded that he could not have taken those parts to which I objected, as such an opinion given by the Reporter upon such parts would have involved his own competency as a Reporter.

\* It may be proper to add, that Mr. Barker will not have the opportunity of seeing this rejoinder until the pamphlet is completed, so that he cannot reply thereto; but it has, according to arrangement, been submitted to the chairman of his committee, Mr. Halliwell.

5. "But," Mr. Barker asks, "have I added as many words as Lloyd Jones says I have?" Yes, sir, you have. "Let any one count the words in the Reporter's copy, and read the speeches as printed in this publication, and they will see for themselves I have done no such thing." Granted, sir, let them do so, and if they do not find it as I have stated it, I shall most willingly consent to be considered all that you have taken so much trouble to prove me. Cave and Sever have the manuscript, and I have a copy of it, with which I shall most willingly accommodate any one who would like to try the question that way. The gentleman, however, seems to be conscious that if he has added as much as I state, he has done wrong, or I cannot see why he should deny it. I would therefore recommend the gentleman to consult them himself, that he may become conscious of the enormity of his sin, and endeavour, as soon as possible, to make the necessary atonement.

6. What Mr. Barker has said about his fast speaking will not answer his purpose at present, although I am perfectly aware that he both writes and speaks much faster than discretion can always sanction. But he should remember that I read a great deal from history, and that I always did so in a hurried manner, knowing that it would be furnished from my books; and also, that he himself stated in my presence that he spoke slowly in order that the Reporter might take down his language correctly.

7. How does Mr. Barker attempt to justify his charge against me of getting the Reporter to correct my speeches? By stating that the Reporter, in extending his notes, *transcribed my quotations from my books*. I ask Mr. B., is that making *alterations*, or is that the idea conveyed in his charge? Mr. B. must know that it is not; and his attempt to shuffle out of it in such a manner, only adds to the disgrace incurred by making such an unfounded charge. But he states that in giving my books I had an advantage over him, as he did not give his books. I appeal to those who attended that Discussion, whether Mr. B. had a book in his hand the whole night but the Bible—a book which the Reporter had no occasion to ask him for, as every man either has a copy or may easily procure one. Mr. Barker's statements about the Reporter's omissions, I shall leave him to settle with the Reporter, merely adding, that I consider that the Reporter executed his work in a masterly manner, and

also that I repeatedly told Mr. B., that if the Reporter *had* made omissions of the kind complained of, I should not object to his correcting them, but that I could not think of allowing him to give to the public, as his speeches, matter to which he never gave utterance. He also states that his speeches, in their most imperfect form, contained sufficient answer to mine ; and yet the gentleman has not only mended his speeches, but has also kept up a running fire in his Evangelical Reformer, and finished by a grand discharge of artillery in his Appendix. I should think the gentleman feels quite satisfied that I am quietly inurned.

8. How, I would ask, does Mr. Barker attempt to get out of the difficulty in which his reference to Mr. Geo. Cave involved him ? His first statement was, that I referred him to the Reporter. This I denied. He then stated that I did so in the presence of G. Cave. G. Cave is then called, and says that he does not recollect it. "Oh," exclaims Mr. B. "I did not say he *recollected* it ; he *might* have heard it and *forgot* !" I say again, how unfortunate it is for this man that he should have so far forgotten himself as to call a respectable witness.

9. Mr. Barker, at page 143 of his Appendix, enumerates six propositions which he states he made to me for the purpose of bringing the matter to a close. Of these the first was never made ; the second also was never made : nevertheless I have acted strictly in accordance with it ; and I would ask him how it comes that he himself is the party who has violated it ? The third was made and rejected for its impracticability, as the whole of our previous delay was occasioned by having a committee of three on each side, who neutralized each other, and rendered a decision impossible. The fourth was never made. The fifth was made and rejected, because I considered it was what the gentleman was aiming at during the whole of the dispute, he being utterly ashamed of the mode in which he had acted his part in the affair ; and this being rejected, the only chance he had to save his credit was to *alter* and *amend*, until, as has before been remarked, the original features of his speeches are almost lost in the patches and paint he has laid on. The sixth was also made and refused ; because I considered him, in consequence of the conduct\* he had displayed,

\* I offer the following as a specimen of his shameless disregard of truth and decency, in justification of my declining any further

totally unfit for further communication; and I would also state that such opinion is yet unaltered.

10. Mr. Barker then goes on to state that he knows not what else I wanted, unless it was to correct his speeches as well as my own. Let it, however, be understood, that I have not corrected my own, neither did I wish to correct his speeches. In his unfortunate Sheffield letter he stated that I did correct his speeches, and gave them to the printer to set up. In my first Appendix I offered to refer this matter to the printer; this, however, Mr. B. in his reply, has thought proper to pass over in silence, which proves that he was fully aware of the dangerous nature of such appeal.

He concludes his reply by wishing that I may yet enjoy with *him* and others of my happier countrymen, "the pleasures and delights of *genuine piety*."—"Genuine piety!"—Faugh! After this, King Richard's—"I thank my God for my humility,"—becomes stale and flat.

I now drop this unpleasant subject, sorry that the necessity of the case has rendered such a lengthy intrusion on the time of the reader indispensable.

LLOYD JONES.

P. S.—Since writing the above, my attention has been drawn to charges made by Mr. Barker (p. 150) against some Socialists, with a statement of his ability to make more. As the gentleman has not supplied the names in any of these cases, I cannot pretend to say to whom he alludes; I believe most sincerely they are every one false, and an honest man would be ashamed to make them. The only case in which we are enabled to discover the party alluded to is that taken from G. Rees's pamphlet, a pamphlet which he states the Socialists of Manchester suppressed by intimidating the booksellers. This is as false as falsehood can be. I believe that a private friend (who was no Socialist) of the party alluded to served notices on the booksellers; but to say that the Socialists did it, is to say what is very false. If what this person is charged with ever took place, (a thing I very much doubt,) it must have been long before he became a Socialist; for since then my own experience tells me that he is both a good father and a good husband; and supposing it all to be true, it speaks loudly for the moralizing effects of Socialism.

L. J.

communication with him; it is from page 28 of his "Overthrow of Infidel Socialism:"—"No man on earth," he says, "who has not read their (the Socialists') works, can conceive the *horrible obscenity* and *filthiness* to be found in them. I should do wrong to repeat the sentiments contained in their works: *the mention of them would confound you; and cause every man and woman to hang down their heads with shame. Every community is to be one vast brothel; the children are to be systematically trained to use the filthiest language that corruption can utter, and to regard shame and modesty as vices. They are to be allowed to mix with one another without restraint, as a herd of sheep, or a community of dogs; and encouraged in every kind of lawless and infamous intercourse.*" His pamphlet abounds with passages equally false and gross; and yet this man talks of his "*genuine piety*!"



